THE Presbyterians Unmask'd: OR, ANIMADVERSIONS UPON A Nonconformist Book, CALLED, *The Interest of* ENGLAND IN THE *Matter of* RELIGION.

Samuel Thomas

Nihil Feci dicis; Imo Nihil Fateris.

Non Quis, sed Quid. Not Who, but What.

LONDON,
Printed for R. Royston, Bookseller to his most Sacred Majesty, at the Angel in *Amen-Corner*, 1676.

THE PREFACE.

THough perhaps there have been ſeveral Junctures ſince 1661. wherein the publiſhing of theſe Animadverſions (which were then finiſhed) would have been judged more ſeaſonable, yet I muſt profeſs my ſelf in the number of thoſe men who believe nothing of this nature can come out *unſeaſonably*, till either the *Old cauſe* ceaſe to be thought *good*, or elſe the *good old cauſe* ceaſe to be on the Anvile. And who can imagine but that it is ſo ſtill when men ſtill endeavour to ſupport factious Parties in oppoſition to the Laws of the Land? Nay have the impudence to inveigh even againſt the Laws themſelves that were deſign-

ed to ſecure the State for the future, againſt the malignant influences, and the diſturbing pernicious attempts of *Presbyterian* (as well as other Sectarian) Spirits, witneſs that late vile *Letter from a Perſon of Quality to his Friend in the Countrey*; in which *the able, but more daring* Author accuſes the Act for regulating Corporations as *keeping many of the wealthieſt, worthieſt and ſobereſt men out of the Magiſtracy of thoſe places*: The Act which ſettled the Militia, as *eſtabliſhing a ſtanding Army by a Law, and ſwearing us into a Military Government.* (Whereas nothing does more juſtify the neceſſity of a ſtanding Army (of which ſuch a jealouſie is pretended) than the croſs-grain'd ſeditious humours of thoſe men who exclaim moſt againſt it.) The Five-mile-*Oxford*-Act, as *impoſing a moſt unlawful and*

and unjustifiable Oath; and the Act for Uniformity, as that which rendered *Bartholomew-day fatal to our Church, and Religion, in throwing out a very great number of worthy learned pious and Orthodox Divines.* In which glorious Titles *the Presbyterian Divines* were without doubt intended to have the greatest share, and the *Lay-Presbyterians* in the forementioned character of the *Wealthiest, Worthiest, and Soberest men.* 'Tis a wonder he did not add [*and most loyal Subjects*;] but it may be he was not *so intimately acquainted* with them as this *John Corbet* was, who is so profuse and lavish of his praises as to commend *Presbyterians even on this score too.* [*We affirm boldly*, says he, *that those for whom we plead* (viz. Presbyterians) *must needs be good Subjects to a Christian King, and good members of a Christian*

Interest of England, p. 66. 2. Edit.

Christian Commonwealth.] The Man I confess has an excellent knack at *whitening Æthiopians, and putting Wolves into sheeps clothing*: But he must not be angry if we endeavour (for our own and other mens security) to strip them of that covering, lest under the specious disguises of *Religion*, *Reformation*, and *Liberty* they once more rend and tear us, and make us a prey to *Atheism*, *Confusion*, and *Tyranny*. It concerns us to have the *Presbyterian vizor* taken off, and these *worthy*, *learned*, *sober*, *serious* Gentlemen of the padd exposed in their proper shape and features, that so they may be too well known to be suffered to *rob us* any more of our Laws, Government, Order, Peace and tranquillity. And therefore he does a very good office who *at any time* gives men warning to take heed

of

of these *devouring Sepulchres*: And because this *demure* Author had taken so much pains to make them appear beautiful outwardly, I thought it worth mine to pare away the grass, and to set a fresh mark upon them, that so honest men might not fall into them unawares, nor permit themselves to be again defiled with Presbyterian uncleanness.

Imprimatur

Maii 2. 1676. *G. Jane R. P. D. Henr. Episcopo Lond. à Sac. Dom.*

ANIMADVERSIONS

on a Book Entitled,

The Intereſt of

ENGLAND

in the matter of

RELIGION.

THE Author having told us, *Page* 16. (26. 2. *Edit.*) that *among the various diſagreeing Parties within this Kingdom, two main ones appear above the reſt, viz. the Epiſcopal, and Presbyterian; and that the diſunion between theſe Parties muſt be removed either by the abolition of one Party, or by the coalition of both into one, or by a toleration indulg'd to the weaker ſide*, he proceeds *p.* 17. (27.) (without ſtaying to inform us how diſunion of Parties may be ſaid to be remov'd either by the abolition, or toleration of one Party) to that which he preſumes the great caſe of the time, and therefore propoſes it as the ſubject of his diſcourſe, *viz.* in which of theſe three ways, Abolition, Coalition, or Toleration the true Intereſt of the King and Kingdom lies. And the firſt thing that he enquires into is,

[*Whether in Justice or reason of State the Presbyterian Party should be rejected and depressed, or protected and encouraged?*]

Which Party he distinguishes from Prelatists by these Characters (which p.20. (30.) he calls *their main and rooted Principles.*) 1. *They admire and magnify the holy Scriptures, and take them for the absolute perfect Rule of Faith and life without the supplement of Ecclesiastical Tradition — yet they deny not due respect and reverence to venerable Antiquity.* 2. *They assert the study and knowledge of the Scriptures to be the duty and priviledge of all Christians — yet they acknowledge the necessity of a standing Gospel-ministery, and receive the directive Authority of the Church, not with implicit Faith, but the Judgment of Discretion.* 3. *They hold the teaching of the Spirit necessary to the saving knowledge of Christ — yet they hold not that the Spirit brings new Revelations.* 4. *They exalt divine ordinances, but debase humane inventions in Gods worship, particularly Ceremonies, properly religious, and of instituted, mystical signification — yet they allow the natural expressions of reverence and devotion, as kneeling, and lifting up of the hands and eyes in prayer: as also those meer circumstances of decency and order, the omission whereof would make the service of God either undecent or less decent.* 5. *They rejoyce in Christ Jesus having no confidence in a legal righteousness, but desire to be found in him who is made unto us righteousness by gracious imputation: yet withal they affirm constantly that good works of piety towards*

wards God, and of justice and charity towards men are necessary to salvation. 6. *Their Doctrine bears full conformity with that of the Reformed Churches held forth in their publick confessions, and particularly with that of the Church of* England *in the* 39 *Articles; only one or two passages peradventure excepted so far as they may import the asserting of Prelacy, and humane mystical Ceremonies.* 7. *They insist much on the necessity of Regeneration, and therein lay the ground-work for the practice of Godliness.* 8. *They press upon themselves and others the severe exercise not of a Popish outside, formal, but a spiritual and real mortification, and self-denial according to the power of Christianity.* 9. *They are strict observers of the Lords day, and constant in Family-Prayer.* 10. *They abstain from Oaths, yea petty Oaths, and the irreverent usage of Gods name in common discourse.* 11. *They are sober, just and circumspect in their whole conversation. Such,* says he, *is the temper and constitution of this Party, which in its full latitude lies in the middle between those that affect a ceremonial worship and the heighe of Hierarchical Government on the one hand, and those that reject an ordained ministery and settled Church-Order and regular Unity on the other hand.*

Now either the man would have all these particularly look'd upon as truly discriminating characters of the Presbyterians, from the Prelatical party, or he would not; if he would not, to what end does he here mention them? and

that as middle Principles in reference to the two extremes, *viz.* Prelatists and rejecters of an Ordain'd ministery and settled Church-order, and regular unity? if he would, with what face, justice or honesty, does he imply that the Prelatists magnify not the holy Scriptures as the absolute, perfect, rule of Faith and life? that they deny the study and knowledge of the Scriptures to be the duty and priviledge of all Christians, or the teaching of the Spirit to be necessary to the saving knowledge of Christ? that they exalt not divine ordinances? that they worship not God in the spirit according to the simplicity of Gospel-Institutions? that they affirm not constantly good works towards God and men necessary to salvation, &c. Let him evince if he can, that the Prelatists are thus culpable; if he cannot, he deserves to be reckon'd, not in the number of such Presbyterians as are [just and circumspect in their whole behaviour] but of such as practically deny justice and charity towards men to be necessary to salvation. And if he can with truth affirm (as I suppose he may) that the Presbyterian party believe S. *James* his Epistle (and the second chapter of it) to be Canonical Scripture, and that (according to his doctrine verse 10.) he that offends in one point of the Law of liberty is guilty of all, they are little beholding to him for exhibiting such a Character of them to the world, wherein so very few of those excellent vertues taught by our Saviour in his Sermon on the mount, and inculcated as Essential

tial to Christianity and absolutely necessary to salvation, are mentioned as practised by that Party.

I am sure Prelatists have great reason to complain of his fraudulent, disingenuous dealing, in endeavouring to cheat the world with such an imperfect pourtraicture of the Presbyterian party: wherein his behaviour is no more commendable than his would be who had either ignorance or confidence enough to give this as an adequate description of the Sect of the Pharisees, *viz.* They were persons that disdain'd not to hear *John* the Baptist's Sermons, and to come to his Baptism, *Matth.* 3. 5, 7. They gathered together also to hear Christ himself, *Luk.* 5. 17. *Mark* 2. 6. They kept him company at Feasts, as appears from *Mark* 2. 16. and abroad, *Matth.* 12. 2. One of them invited him to his house to Dinner, *Luk.* 7. 36. They made long Prayers, *Matth.* 23. 14. They gave Alms, *Matth.* 6. 2. They fasted twice a week, and gave Tythes of all they had, *Luk.* 18. 12. They outwardly appear'd righteous, *Matth.* 23. 27, 28. They avoided the Society of such as were reputed sinners and offensive in their lives; and therefore accused Christ (though wrongfully) for eating with them, *Matth.* 9. 11. They were the most exact and strictest Sect of the Jewish Religion (their Doctrine was, say some, least corrupt,) of which Sect *Paul* was, Act. 26. 5. Their Disciples as well as S. *John's* were exercised in fasting and prayer, *Luk.* 5. 33. Would our Author account it

candid and sincere dealing if one of the Pharisees friends should present him with such a partial character of them? would he not look upon it as too grossly parasitical, and scandalously favourable? especially if exhibited in order to the resolution of such a question as this, [*Whether the Pharisaical Party ought in Justice to be rejected and depressed, or protected and encouraged by our Saviour?*] or whether they ought to be called Hypocrites, Serpents and a Generation of Vipers, and to have Woe denounced against them eight times in one Sermon? would he think it fairly done to conceal their devouring widows houses? their straining at Gnats, and swallowing Camels? their covetousness? their neglecting the weightier matters of the Law, Judgment, mercy, and Fidelity? Or suppose the question were put [*Whether in justice or reason of State the Jesuits should be rejected and depressed, or protected and encouraged here in* England?] Would he (in order to the decision of this question) rest content with this character of that Society, viz. they believe all the books of the Old and New Testament, (which the English Protestants own) to be the word of God. — They assent to all the Articles of the Creed commonly stalled the Apostles Creed. — They acknowledge the necessity of a standing Gospel-ministry. — They allow the natural expressions of reverence and devotion, and those circumstances of decency and order, the omission whereof would make the Service of God either undecent or less decent,

decent. —They affirm works of piety towards God and of charity towards men, to be necessary to salvation. —I say, would this man judge this character of that Society so entire and comprehensive, as that a more full and impartial decyphering of them would be needless in reference to a right determination of that question? I trow not. Would he not judge this also fit to be considered, *viz.* whether they deny that Faith is to be kept with Protestants? — Whether they own the Kings Supremacy in all matters, over all persons, Ecclesiastical and Civil, within his own Dominions? Whether they will take the Oath of Allegiance and fidelity to Him, his Heirs and Successors? — Whether they approve Subjects taking up Arms against their Soveraign? whether they are persons resolved to yield all due obedience to the Laws of the Land and constitutions of our lawful Governours both Ecclesiastical and Civil, supreme and subordinate? Surely Reason of State (if by that be meant State-Policy in order to self-preservation) will prompt all Kings and Princes diligently and deliberately to enquire and consider, whether those who would be protected and encouraged by them deserve to have such a black character affixt upon them or no, and consequently they might justly treat that Writer with severity who should dare to move Kings to protect and encourage such persons, by giving in a list of a few wholsome opinions of theirs, and trecherously (or rather traiterously) concealing their damnable and pernicious tenents.

That this mans Character of the English Presbyterians is of this nature may be evident to any person that reflects upon and seriously considers their solemn League and Covenant, fram'd and imposed in the time of the Long Parliament, in the first Article whereof they swear that *they will sincerely and constantly endeavour in their places and callings the preservation of the Reformed Religion,* [*in the Church of* Scotland,] *in Doctrine, Worship,* [*Discipline and Government.*] Now the Scotch Author of [Ladensium Autokatakrisis] in his Postscript against *Lysimachus Nicanor*, tells us, p. 35. that *Episcopacy is no way so opposite to the Discipline of* [*any reformed Church*] *as to that Discipline which many Assemblies and Parliaments have settled in* Scotland: and therefore he concludes thus, *p.*36 37. [*we cannot dissemble any longer our hearty wishes,* —*that* England *would after the example of all the reformed Churches rid themselves at last of their Bishops trouble, as they did of old, without any repentance to this day, of their Abbots and Monks. This,* says he, *we conceive would much increase the joy and prosperity of all the three Dominions.* Accordingly those Covenanters swore also to *endeavour the reformation of Religion in the Kingdoms of* England *and* Ireland *in Doctrine, Worship, Discipline and Government, according to the word of God, and* [*the example*] *of the best reformed Churches.* Now all the reformed Churches, as the same Author affirms, p. 35. cast out at first, and to this day have carefully holden at the door even

that

that kind of Episcopacy which their chief Divines seem'd not much to oppose. Suitable whereunto is that which Presbyterians sware in the second Article of the Covenant, *viz. to endeavour the extirpation of Church-Government by Bishops (as well as by Archbishops, Chancellors, Commissaries, &c.)* With what face therefore can this Author presume to tell us, p. 19. (29.) that *the Form of Ecclesiastical Government by Parochial and Classical Presbyteries, Provincial and National Assemblies, is remote enough from the main cause of Presbytery?* especially since he affirms, p. 24. (34.) that *one of his Majesties Kingdoms* (Scotland) is *Presbyterian*, by which sure he means not [moderately Episcopal:] for p. 59. (69.) that he may prove the Presbyterian Form of Government a Fence against Heresies and Errors, he instances in the Form of Ecclesiastical Policy and method of Discipline in the Church of *Scotland*, which (as there described) is no otherwise than by Parochial and Classical Presbyteries, Provincial and National Assemblies. Now how injurious the Scotch Discipline (which English Presbyterians have thus covenanted to introduce) is to the civil magistrate, how oppressive to the subject, and pernicious to both, Bishop *Bramhall*, (since Primate of *Ireland*) hath abundantly manifested in his [*Fair warning for* England *to take heed of the Scotch Discipline*; or as 'tis lately Printed, *of the Presbyterian Government.*] In which treatise he endeavours to prove that their Discipline doth utterly overthrow

throw the rights of Magistrates to convocate Synods, to confirm their Acts, to order Ecclesiastical Affairs, and reform the Church within their Dominions; that it robs the Magistrate of the last Appeal of his Subjects; that it exempts the Ministers from due punishment; that it subjects the supreme magistrate to their Censures; that it robs him of his pardoning power (as to some crimes) of his civil power in order to Religion; that it makes a monster of the Commonwealth, is most prejudicial to the Parliament, is oppressive to particular persons, and hurtful to all orders of men; that the Disciplinarians challenge this exorbitant power by Divine right. The truth of these propositions he hath evinc'd out of their Books of Discipline, and publick Records of their practice. Since therefore the English Presbyterians have sworn to endeavour the preservation of this Discipline and Government in the Church of *Scotland*, and to reform the Discipline and Government here in *England*, according to the Example of the reformed Church in *Scotland*, 'tis but a piece of justice and reason that the King's Majesty should look upon them as persons owning those seditious Principles, upon which such enormous Disciplinarian practices are grounded. Some of which Principles are these: 1. *That their National Assemblies ought always to be retain'd in their own liberties (of convening lawfully together, p. 7.) with power to the Kirk to appoint times and places.* 2. *That they have power to abolish and abrogate all Statutes and Ordinances*

concerning

concerning Ecclesiastical matters, that are found noysome and unprofitable, and agree not with the time, or are abused by the people; and to make Rules and Constitutions for keeping good order in the Kirk, (p. 8.) 3. That Ecclesiastical Discipline ought to be exercised, whether it be ratified by the civil magistrate or no, p. 9, 12. 4. That from the Kirk there is no reclamation nor appellation to any judge Civil or Ecclesiastical within the Realm, p. 13. 5. That to their Discipline all the Estates within the Realm must be subject, as well Rulers as they who are ruled, p. 16. 6. That the Civil Magistrate cannot pardon any crime that was made capital by the judicial Law, p. 12. 7. That matters of the Pulpit ought to be exempted from the judgment and correction of Princes, p. 14. In proportion to which principles, the Kirk p. 5. by their own Authority decreed the abolition of Bishops, requiring them to resign their offices (as not having any call from Gods word) under pain of Excommunication, and to desist from preaching till they had a new admission from the general Assembly. ---They resolv'd also to dispose of their possessions as the Kings Patrimony in the next Assembly. ---When they could not prevail to have their Book of Discipline ratified by the Civil Authority, they obtruded it on the Church themselves, p. 6. ordaining that all those who had born or did then bear any office in the Church should subscribe it under pain of excommunication. ---By their own authority also, p. 7. under the specious title of Jesus Christ, King of Kings,

Kings, and Lord of Lords, the only Monarch of this Church, and under pretence of his prerogative Royal they erected their own Courts and Presbyteries in the most part of Scotland, *long before they were legally approv'd or receiv'd. ——In their Assembly at* Edenburgh, 1647. *they determined, that nothing should be pass'd in the next Parliament till the Church was fully restored to its Patrimony; yea,* (says the Lord Primate p. 5.) *they arrived to that degree of sauciness,* Anno 1600. *and reduced the Soveraign power to such contempt that* 20 *Presbyters* (*no more at the highest, sometimes but* 13, *sometimes but* 7 *or* 8) *dar'd to hold and maintain a general Assembly* (*as they miscall'd it*) *after it was discharged by the King, against his Authority; an Insolence which never any Parliament durst attempt.* Anno 1582. *they rejected* Mongomery's *appeal from themselves to King* James, *as made to an incompetent Judge, and proceeded violently against him notwithstanding the Kings prohibition, p.* 13. They who have a mind to see more instances of the like nature may read that Book of the Archbishop.

Now the Question must be, 1. whether those English Presbyterians who have covenanted to endeavour the Preservation of the Discipline and Government of the Church of *Scotland*, ought not to be look'd upon as persons approving those Principles and practices upon which that Discipline and Government is founded and exercised? 2. Whether those English Presbyterians who have covenanted to endeavour the reformation

of

of Religion in the Kingdom of *England* in Discipline and Government according to the example of the best reformed Churches, in the number of which Churches they may well be supposed to reckon the Kirk of *Scotland*, ought not to be look'd upon as persons engaging themselves to imitate that Kirk by endeavouring the Introduction of the like practices here in *England*, grounded on the like principles? 3. Whether therefore such an approbation of those Principles and Practices ought not in justice to have been mentioned as part of their Character? and 4. Whether persons that may justly have such a character affixt upon them, ought in justice or reason of State to be protected and encouraged, or rejected and depressed?

Whereas this Author tells us, p. 24. (34.) [that *the men of the Presbyterian perswasion are not lukewarm, but true zelots.*] I answer, They are so much the more dangerous and more likely to be Instruments of mischief, unless their zeal be ballasted with knowledge and discretion, and exerted in lawful ways. Indeed if they are like the *Scotch* Disciplinarian zelots before mentioned, they are so far from being lukewarm, that they are rather Seditious Incendiaries, and prone to nothing more than the kindling of devouring Fires in that Nation where they are encourag'd.

Nevertheless, says he, *they have no fellowship with the spirit of Enthusiastical and Anabaptistical fancy and frenzy.*] What! not in *their main and rooted Principles*? By which he characterizes them,

p. 20,

p. 20, 21. (30, 31.) which I intimate chiefly as another Argument of the lameness and imperfection of that character. We have reason to believe that our modern Presbyterians are somewhat better than their Forefathers, if they do not agree with them and the Anabaptists: 1. In disturbing the Church under pretence of reforming it. 2. In labouring both by conferences in private, and by Sermons in publick to draw the common people from their liking the present State. 3. In publishing factious Books to the view of the world. 4. In disdaining and reproaching Magistrates for endeavouring to bring them to conformity by compulsion. 5. In slandering and reviling those Ministers that withstand their factious proceedings, attributing much good to themselves, and pouring contempt and discredit upon their opposites. 6. In impugning the prescript Form of Prayer. 7. In holding that the word of God must of necessity be preach'd before the Administration of the Sacraments. 8. In protesting that they go not about to take any authority from Magistrates, even while they seek to overthrow the Government of the State. That the Anabaptists in *Germany* were thus guilty, and the Presbyterians in *England* in Q. *Elizabeth*'s days, I refer the Reader for proof to *Oliver Ormerod*'s picture of a Puritan, (written about those times, and reprinted 1605.) wherein he endeavours to prove, that the Puritans then resembled the Anabaptists in above fourscore Points. See also Archbishop *Whitgift*'s defence of his Answer to the Admonition, *p.* 33, 34. (*in Fol.*)

And

And I wish it were not easie to manifest, that our late Covenanting Presbyterians have had too much fellowship with the spirit of these Anabaptistical Frenzies now mention'd, ---- *who*, says this Author, *are no Fanaticks, although they begin to be by some abus'd under that name.* But he might have known that turbulent Presbyterians have been so call'd long since, by one that had skill enough to give persons such names as were suitable to their Natures, even King *James* himself in his Βασιλ. Δῶρον, *B.* 2. where speaking of some *Scotch* Puritans, such fiery-spirited-Presbyterians as endeavoured to introduce a parity in the Church; *you shall never find*, says he, *with any High-land or Border Thieves more lies and vile perjuries, than with those Fanatick Spirits, &c.*

But, says this Author, *they are persons of known learning, prudence, piety, and gravity in great numbers.*] Here it may be question'd, 1. How he can prove this *Encomium* of them to be true? 2. Whether the Quakers do not excel them in gravity, the Anabaptists in piety, the Independents in prudence, the Prelatists in learning, and some Jesuits in all four? and yet this Author seems willing enough to have all these parties rejected and depressed.

[*Besides of inferior rank a vast multitude of knowing, serious, honest people.*] 1. This also wants proof. 2. The more learning, prudence, piety, and gravity, those of the superior rank have, the more peaceably and quietly they will live

live under lawful Governours, and the more obediently they will submit to their Laws; which therefore if either they or those of inferior rank refuse to do, they are either less knowing or less serious and honest than in conscience it concerns those to be, who expect to be protected and encouraged by Governors.

[*None of all which are led blindfold by Tradition or implicit Faith.*]

This man sure is a very knowing person himself, if he be so well acquainted with all the Presbyterians, as to be able to aver this of them all, or of a vast multitude of them upon good grounds. But is he indeed certain that none of them are so lazy, ignorant, and sottish, as to be led blindfold by the Tradition and dictates of their Presbyterian Parsons? Did none of them by an implicit Faith believe it lawful to take the Covenant? Do none of them by an implicit Faith believe the Rites and Forms by Law and Canons established among us unlawful? p. 29. (39) Was it not an implicit Faith (in the seditious Doctrines of the Society of *Jesus*) whereby they believed it lawful to take up Arms against their lawful Soveraign?

[*Or do run headlong into Fanatick delusions.*]

Are any turn'd Fanaticks at last but those that were first such Presbyterians as himself describes, p. 21, 22?

[*But they give up themselves to the sole direction and authority of the holy Scriptures.*]

He hath told us before, that *they deny not due respect*

reſpect and reverence to venerable Antiquity, p.20. (30.) Let him ſhew if he can, how they reſpect and reverence venerable Antiquity, if they afford it not [ſome directive] Authority. 2. Why may not Independents and Anabaptiſts as well be ſaid to give up themſelves to the ſole direction and Authority of the holy Scriptures, as Presbyterians?

[*Wherefore impartial Reaſon will conclude, that they choſe this way as with ſincerity of affection, ſo with gravity of judgment; and that the things themſelves, even the more diſputable part of them (as that againſt the Hierarchy and Ceremonies) are ſuch as may frequently prevail with good and wiſe men.*]

Which inference ſignifies nothing till the truth of the premiſes be clear'd, except the Authors confidence that the Prelatiſts have reaſon to believe whatſoever he ſays in the praiſe of Presbyterians, merely becauſe he is bold enough to ſay it.

[*Inaſmuch as they appear to thoſe that have embrac'd them, to have the Impreſs of Divine Authority, and the Character of Evangelical Purity.*]

Dares this Author deny that the Principles of other Sectaries appear to thoſe that have embrac'd them to have the Impreſs of Divine Authority, and the Character of Evangelical Purity? If not, does it follow that thoſe men alſo choſe their way with ſincerity of affection and gravity of judgment? or that their opinions may frequently pre-

vail with good and wiſe men? if it does not follow, why does he argue ſo weakly and injudiciouſly?

[*For the reaſons aforegoing, the infringment of due liberty in theſe matters would perpetuate moſt unhappy controverſies in the Church from age to age.*]

It ſeems the man is of opinion, that all parties ought to be tolerated, yea encouraged, who chuſe their way with ſincerity of affection and gravity of judgment, and upon ſuch grounds as may frequently prevail with good and wiſe men, inaſmuch as they appear to them to have the Impreſs of Divine Authority, and the Character of Evangelical Purity. If he be not of this opinion, let him ſhew why Presbyterians ought to be encouraged, and not others that have the ſame qualifications. If he be, let him produce convincing Arguments that other Sects have not all theſe qualifications, that is, that the Independents, Anabaptiſts, and Quakers were for the generality either Fools or Knaves, when they choſe thoſe ways. Beſides, does he imagine that the Independents, Anabaptiſts, and Quakers are not as deſirous of due liberty in their way as the Presbyterians are in theirs? or that the men of thoſe perſwaſions are ſo lukewarm in their affections, or ſo inconſiderable for their number, as that the infringment of their liberty will not perpetuate moſt unhappy Controverſies in this Church? *Ergò*, by this Authors (Presbyterian) Logick, they ought in reaſon of State to be protected and encouraged as well as Presbyterians. If

If the three next Pages prove any thing, they evince that the Presbyterian Leaven will from time to time sowre the lump of this Church and State, if such literally-polemical, and unchristianly-practical Teachers, as too many of them are, be protected and encouraged. 'Tis no wonder that Tares should grow where they are suffered to be sown; and that they should spoil the Wheat where they are nourished. I find it observed by a late writer, out of Bishop *Bancroft*, that he long since *plainly foretold, that the Puritans would never give over their clamour for Reformation, till they had utterly ruined the whole Kingdom and Church: and yet*, said he, *there are divers* (meaning men in great places) *that would gladly have these things smothered up, being willing to think that the Puritans were no such dangerous men as he and others did take them to be; only scrupulous and peevish perhaps about Ceremonies, and therefore were willing to forbear them, and not to censure them sharply.* But that Prelate did wisely tell them, *That if any such mischiefs* (*which God forbid*) *shall happen hereafter, they were sufficiently warned, that both should and might* (*in good time*) *have prevented them; and withall it would then be found true which* Livy *says*, Urgentibus Rempublicam fatis, Dei & hominum salutares admonitiones spernuntur. ----- *When the Lord for the sins of a people is purposed to punish any Country, he blindeth the eyes of the wise so as they shall either neglect or not perceive*

See the Apologie for Bishops sitting and voting in Parliament, p. 73.

ceive the ordinary means for the safety thereof, &c.

This Author would perswade us, *p.* 29. (39.) that *the numerous Presbyterian party will not vary from it self, or vanish upon changes in Government or new Accidents; for it rests not upon any private, temporary, variable occasion, but upon a cause perpetual and everlasting. Those forementioned principles of science and practice which give it its proper being, are of that firm and fixt nature, that new contingencies will not alter them, nor length of time wear them out.*] To which I answer: 1. If this Party is so invariable, how comes it to pass that those Rites and Ceremonies which himself tells us, *p.* 28. (38.) were heretofore by the greatest part of the Ministers nam'd Puritans, look'd upon, and yielded to as things in their own nature [Indifferent,] are now accounted (*p.* 29. (39) by most of this way [Unlawful?] Does not this argue a variation in this Party from it self? Hath not length of time worn out those their former Principles of science and practice? Dr. *John Burges* (in his Preface to his answer in Vindication of Bishop *Morton* touching Ceremonies) tells us, *p.* 11. that *the State* (*in K.* James *his Reign*) *would never suffer these Ceremonies to be questioned of* [*unlawfulness*] *which Dr.* Reynolds, *Dr.* Chaderton, *Dr.* Spark, *and the rest of the most eminent men of this Nation, who seem'd to favour that Party, would neither affirm to be unlawful, nor be known that any of that side were so* [*weak*] *as to think so.* But now it seems the men

sam'd

fam'd so much by this Author for their Learning and Orthodoxy, their excelling in Polemical and Practical Divinity, *p.* 23. (33.) these Judicious and Prudent men that have no Fellowship with Anabaptistical Fancy and Frenzy, *p.* 24. (34.) these knowing and wise men, (*p.* 24, 25.) these fixt and unalterable men, *p.* 29. (39.) are grown so weak and feeble in their Intellectuals, so Feminine in their resolves, as to deem them unlawful. Again, if they are such an invariable Party in their Principles of science and practice, what's the reason that in these days they have Covenanted to endeavour the extirpation of that *English* Hierarchy which in the days of yore their Presbyterian Ancestors were far from condemning as wicked and intolerable? Witness this passage which *Crakanthorp* in his *Defens. Eccles. Anglicanæ contra Archiepisc. Spalat. p.* 243. quotes out of *Henry Jacob*, one of that Party, who in his Tract *de Veritate Vocat. Minister. p.* 88. against *Johnson* the Brownist, speaks thus; *Quisquis quicquam de Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ Statu intelligit, non potest non videre multos eosque doctos in Ecclesiâ Anglicanâ sentire & docere Hierarchicum quod nunc est in eâ Regimen unicum esse verum ac legitimum Regiminis genus; ferè omnes (etiam Puritanos) idem ut indifferens & legitimum agnoscere, perpaucos verò & vix usquam quenquam invenies qui ut malum, impium aut non ferendum judicant.* He that understands any thing of the State of the *English* Church, cannot but see that many learned men in the Church of *England* believe and teach, that the Hierarchical

Government by which 'tis ruled, is the only true and legitimate Form of Government: and that almoſt all men acknowledge it indifferent and lawful: and that there are very few, ſcarce any men any where to be found who judge it evil, wicked, or intolerable. Thus he, who in the ſame P. is quoted by that Doctor as expreſſing himſelf to this purpoſe in behalf of the *Engliſh* Church-Government and Diſcipline. *Hæc verò Chriſti eſſe dicuntur, licet non à Chriſto ſed ab Eccleſiâ mandata & præſcripta ſint, cùm Eccleſiæ Authoritatem Chriſtus dedit ea quæ commoda ipſi viſa erant inſtituendi & præſcribendi. Ex hoc genere & regimen Eccleſiaſticum & Ceremonias dicimus, quia non ſimpliciter in Fundamento aut Verbo Dei ut perpetuò obſervanda traduntur, ſed arbitrio Eccleſiæ & Magiſtratuum relinquuntur. Sic nos de his docemus, tenemus, & perſuaſi ſumus nihil uſquam in ſacris literis repugnans, ſed potius his conſona reperiri. ----- Quòd ſi objicias multos inter nos ſecus ſentire, reſpondeo, Generale hoc eſſe & Miniſtrorum & Eccleſiarum Anglicanarum de his judicium, etiamſi unus fortè aut duo ex centenis aut millenis ſecus opinentur.* Theſe things, viz. the Hierarchical Government and Diſcipline are truly ſaid to be of Chriſt, though they are not commanded and preſcribed by Chriſt but the Church, foraſmuch as Chriſt hath given the Church Authority to inſtitute and preſcribe thoſe things which to her ſeem expedient; of this kind we affirm Eccleſiaſtical Government and Ceremonies to be, becauſe they are not ſimply and imme-

immediately founded on the Word of God, or delivered there as immutable Constitutions, but are left to the pleasure of the Church and Magistrates. This is our Doctrine and opinion touching these things; and we are perswaded that nothing can be found in sacred Writ repugnant, but several passages agreeable to these sentiments: And if it be objected that many among us are of another mind; I answer, That this is the Judgment of the generality, both of the Ministers and Churches in *England*, though perhaps one or two among a hundred or a thousand opine otherwise.

But now it seems the Presbyterian party is so variable and alterable from these its quondam-opinions and principles, as to imagine those Rites and Forms which the Church hath prescribed, unlawful, and that the Hierarchical Form of Church-Government ought to be extirpated. And if they are now changed (in their science and practice) though to the worse from what they were heretofore, why may we not hope that (if not meerly length of time, yet) some afflicting contingencies may make them change hereafter for the better from what they are now? I doubt I should rather enquire whether there be any thing besides this Authors bare word to secure us that they will not still grow worse and worse, deceiving and being deceived. Certain I am, the more unalterable they are in these their Fancies, the more mischief they are like to do in that State that encourages them. But what kind

of Argument is this, ----The Presbyterians will not vary from themselves, therefore they ought in justice and reason of State to be protected and encouraged by his Majesty? Is not this as good? The Jesuits will not vary from themselves; those Principles of Science and practice which they own and are actuated by, are of that firm and fixt nature, that new contingencies will not alter them, nor length of time wear them out: *Ergo*, Jesuits ought not in justice or reason of State to be rejected and depressed, but protected and encouraged by our King and Kingdome. One may suspect by this manner of arguing in the behalf of the Presbyterian party, that the Author of it was either a Jesuit, since his reasoning is so favourable to that society; or an half-witted Presbyterian, so dull as not to discern, that several of his arguments conclude as forcibly for the encouragement of Jesuits among us as Presbyterians.

But in this p. 29. (39.) 'tis suggested that *the Presbyterians are* [*a numerous*] *Party* —— *and that the imposing of such matters of Controversie as by* [*so many*] *are held unlawful*, —— *cannot procure the peace of the Kingdom.*] I might here ask whether the Anabaptists or Quakers are not altogether as numerous as that Presbyterian party which holds our Church-Ceremonies unlawful. Nay, are not the Independents themselves as numerous? for I confess I am in good hopes that there are comparatively but very few Presbyterians given up to such blindness of mind,

mind, such strong delusions, as to believe our Ceremonies unlawful. But my answer is this.

If that Party be indeed so numerous that the endeavouring to reject and depress them will probably prove pernicious to the King and Kingdom, perhaps State-policy will dictate that it should not be endeavoured. But I affirm withal that though they were twice as numerous, yet (unless their Practice contradict their Doctrine) there is no such danger will accrue to the King or Kingdom by their rejection. For if this Author does not grosly abuse and impose upon his Readers, *p.* 54, 55. The Presbyterians are such learned knowing creatures, as to teach faith and holiness, as also *obedience active in all lawful things, and passive in things unlawful, injoyn'd by the higher power.* Now they that are resolv'd to be passively obedient, will not be instruments of mischief in a Kingdome, (though they are never so numerous) they will live peaceably, neither railing with the Tongue nor smiting with the Fist of wickedness; and therefore if the Presbyterians are indeed such good men and such good Christians (in this particular) they may (notwithstanding their number) be rejected and depressed (in State-Policy) because of their other perswasions repugnant to the publick profession of the Nation, since their suppression will not prejudice the peace of the Church or Kingdome.

In *p.* 30. (40.) (after some non-sensical-contradictious canting in praise of Presbyterians, for

for how can the inward ſpirit of Presbytery be ſaid to actuate *their whole body*, to knit them each to other, and to remain *in full ſtrength and vigour*, if ſome principal members of that body *fall off and turn prævaricators?*) Our Author enquires what thoſe great things are for which this ſort of men contend? *Surely*, ſays he, *p.* 31. (41.) *they are no other than the lively opening of the pure Doctrine of the Goſpel, the upholding of all Divine Inſtitutions; particularly the ſtrict obſervation of the Lord's day, a laborious and efficacious miniſtry, taking hold of the conſcience and reaching to the heart, a Godly Diſcipline correcting true and real Scandals and diſobedience; in a word, all the neceſſary and effectual means of unfeigned Faith, and holy life, that the Kingdome of God may come in power. And for theſe things ſake they are alienated from the height of Prelacy, and the Pomp of Ceremonious worſhip.*] Say you ſo? It ſeems theſe godly Diſciplinarians do not look upon diſobedience to the Laws eſtabliſhing Prelacy and Ceremonious worſhip as true and real diſobedience; nor the ſcandal ariſing from that diſobedience as true and real Scandal; or elſe they implicitely confeſs that the Presbyterians thus ſcandalouſly diſobedient, were not chaſtis'd by the Biſhops ſo ſeverely as they deſerv'd. It ſeems they fancy that Prelatiſts are enemies to the lively opening of the pure Doctrine of the Goſpel, to ſome divine Inſtitutions, to a laborious and efficacious miniſtery, to Scripture-Diſcipline, to ſome neceſſary and effectual means of unfeigned

ed Faith and holy life; whereas the only proof he offers of this Prelatical guilt is, 1. *Their ſuppreſſing Lectures and Afternoon Sermons*: which is nothing to the purpoſe, unleſs he had proved alſo that theſe are of Divine Inſtitution, or are neceſſary means of unfeigned Faith, and holy Life. 2. *A book for ſports and paſtimes on Sundays enjoyn'd to be read by Miniſters in their Pariſh Churches, under penalty of deprivation.* What? ſo as to exclude either Common-Prayer and preaching in the Morning, or Divine Service and Catechizing in the Afternoon? or ſo as to licence the abſence of any Pariſhioner from that ſervice either part of the day? 3. *Superſtitious Innovations introduc'd; Si accuſâſſe ſuffecerit, quis erit innocens?* 4. *A new Book of Canons compoſed, and a new Oath for upholding the Hierarchy inforc'd.* By whom? were not this Oath and thoſe Canons compoſed in Convocation, by our Church-Governours? were they not confirmed and impoſed by the Royal Aſſent? And why I pray was the new Oath for upholding the Hierarchy eſtabliſh'd by Law more ſuperſtitious than the newer Oath for deſtroying that Hierarchy ſo eſtabliſhed? *Far be it from me*, ſays he, *p.* 32. (42.) *to impute theſe things to all that were in judgment Epiſcopal; for I am perſwaded, a great if not the greater part of them diſallowed theſe Innovations.* Theſe Innovations? what Innovations? The word muſt in reaſon refer to the particulars juſt now enumerated. *viz. The new Book of Canons, the new Oath, the Book for*

ſports

sports and pastimes on Sundays. But are these men in justice and Reason of State to be protected and encouraged, who dare to call new Laws either of State or Church, or both (occasioned by new emergencies) Innovations? or new practices, superstitious, meerly because not commanded in Gods word? Now these things are so far from being a proof of the inconsistency of Prelacy with the lively opening of the pure Doctrine of the Gospel, with the upholding of all Divine Institutions, a laborious and efficacious Ministry, &c. that the contrary is evident from the instance of the Right Reverend Bishop *Morton* (whom this very Author, I believe, hath scarce confidence enough to accuse as a Delinquent in those particulars; since p.67.(77.) he reckons *Bishop Morton in the number of those Episcopal Divines, whose Doctrine is entirely embrac'd by the Presbyterians.*) Who yet did not only approve of, but had the chief hand in contriving and publishing that Declaration which allowed some Sports and Pastimes as that which was then the most probable course to stop the current of Popery and prosaneness, as appears from the story of that Bishop's life, publish'd by Dr. *Barwick*, p. 80, 81. So 'tis evident also from the *Augustan* Confession, *c.* 7. *De Potest. Ecclesiastica*, and Mr. *Calvin*'s Institutions, that both he and the *Lutheran* Reformers were far enough from thinking the Lords day of Divine Institution, who yet were for a lively opening of the pure Doctrine of the Gospel and a laborious efficacious ministry.

In

In some following Pages the Author pretends to manifest, that *the Presbyterian Interest will never be extinguished while the State of* England *continues Protestant. For,* says he, *p.* 34.(44.) *let but the Protestant Doctrine, as 'tis by Law established in the Church of* England, *be upheld and preach'd, and 'twill raise up a genuine off-spring of this people, whose way is no other than the life and power of that Doctrine.*

But I as confidently affirm on the other side, that if the Protestant Doctrine by Law establisht in the Church of *England*, be upheld and preach'd, 'twill raise up such a genuine off-spring of true *English* Protestants, as shall own Prelacy and the Churches Authority in appointing Ceremonies, both which are establisht by that Doctrine, but rejected by Presbyterians. If their way be no other than the life and power of that Doctrine, they act suitably to these Principles, *viz. That the Church hath power to decree Rites or Ceremonies; and authority in Controversies of Faith:* (Artic. 20.) *That whosoever through his private Judgment willingly and purposely doth openly break the Traditions and Ceremonies of the Church, which be not repugnant to the Word of God, and be ordained and approved by common Authority, ought to be rebuked openly* (*that others may fear to do the like*) *as he that offends against the Common Order of the Church, and hurteth the Authority of the Magistrate, and woundeth the consciences of the weak brethren. Every particular or National Church hath authority to ordain, change,*

change, and abolish Ceremonies or Rites of the Church, ordained only by mans authority, so that all things be done to edifying. (Artic. 34.) *They practically own the Kings power within his Realms of* England, Scotland, *and* Ireland, *and all other his Dominions and Countries, as the highest power under God, to whom all men as well inhabitants as born within the same, do by Gods Laws owe most loyalty and obedience afore and above all other Potentates in Earth. They act as if they believed his Majesty to have the same Authority in causes Ecclesiastical, that the godly Kings had among the Jews and Christian Emperors in the Primitive Church. They use the Form of Gods worship in the Church of* England *established by Law, and contained in the Book of Common Prayer, and Administration of the Sacraments, without surmising it to be either corrupt, superstitious or unlawful, or to contain any thing in it that is repugnant to the Scriptures. They are obedient to the Government of the Church of* England, *by Archbishops, Bishops, Deans, Archdeacons, and the rest that bear office in the same; not fancying it to be either Antichristian or repugnant to the word of God. They do not combine themselves together in a new brotherhood, accounting the Christians who are conformable to the Doctrine, Government, Rites and Ceremonies of the Church of* England *to be profane and unmeet for them to joyn with in Christian Profession. They imagine not,* 1. *that any of the* 39. *Articles are in any part superstitious or erroneous; or* 2. *that the Rites and Ceremonies of the Church of* England *by*

Law

Law eſtabliſht are wicked, Antichriſtian, or ſuperſtitious, or ſuch as being commanded by lawful Authority, men who are zealouſly and godly affected may not with any good conſcience approve them, uſe them, or as occaſion requires, ſubſcribe to them; or 3. *that the ſign of the Croſs uſed in Baptiſm is any part of the ſubſtance of that Sacrament. They hold that things of themſelves indifferent do in ſome ſort alter their natures when they are either commanded or forbidden by a lawful Magiſtrate, and may not be omitted at every mans pleaſure, contrary to the Law when they be commanded, nor uſed when they are prohibited.* Theſe are parts of the Doctrine eſtabliſht by Law in the Church of *England*, as is evident from the 1, 2, 4, 7, 9, 5, 6, 30. Canons legally framed and ratified: But where are thoſe Engliſh Presbyterians to be found, whoſe way hath been no other than the life and power of this Doctrine? Have not their practiſes too loudly proclaimed to the world, that they have robbed the King of his Supremacy in Eccleſiaſtical affairs, and traiterouſly placed it in ſome Lords Temporal and Commons? Is the metamorphoſing of our venerable Church-Liturgy into a thing called a Directory; the extirpating of our Church-government by Archbiſhops, Biſhops, Deans, *&c.* the caſting off of the Rites and Ceremonies eſtabliſht by Law, and fancying them unlawful; is this, I ſay, the life and power of that Doctrine before mentioned? Is Covenanting and combining againſt the loyal Aſſerters of the Kings Supremacy and our Liturgy, of our

Prelacy

Prelacy and Ceremonies, as Incendiaries, Malignants and evil Instruments, the life and power of that Doctrine? Durst this *J. C.* have canted at this rate, unless he had before-hand braz'd his Forehead with Impudence? For what besides was it that made him talk thus? and further to say and testifie, that [*Let but the Free use of the Holy Bible be permitted to the common people, and this* [*Presbyterian*] *Generation of men will spring up afresh by the immortal seed of the word.*] Let him prove, if he can, that they will spring up any otherwise than Independents, Anabaptists and Quakers do, *viz.* by a misunderstanding of some places in the holy Bible, and perverting them to unholy practises: which 'tis no great wonder if unlearned and unstable persons (such as too many of the common people are) be guilty of. *Grotius* in his notes on *Cassander*'s consultation, would have the reading of the Scripture permitted to all men, but, *Hauriant*, says he, *quantum necesse ac tutum est; minimè verò de locis omnibus jus sibi sumant interpretandi, sed consulant eruditos*: He would not have them assume to themselves a right of Interpreting all places of Scripture, but to advise with learned men, and ask their judgment: Which counsel (as *Rivet* approved of in his Animadversions, p. 203. so) it behooves common people to follow, lest otherwise that permission occasion their destruction, 2 *Pet.* 3. 16. He goes on,

For that pure spiritual and heavenly Doctrine pressing internal renovation, or the new birth, and the

the way of holy singularity and circumspection, and being written with such Authority and majesty must needs beget though not in the most yet in many a disposition and practice in some sort thereunto conformable.

Which words, by the way, unless understood *cum grano salis*, will smell of Socinianism; but come out of the clouds, O thou Presbyterian, and tell us whether thou thinkest this to be pure spiritual heavenly Doctrine? *Let every soul be subject to the higher powers: Whosoever resisteth the power, resists the Ordinance of God: And they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation. Be subject not for wrath only but for Conscience sake. Where the word of a King is, there is power; and who may say unto him, What dost thou? Mark them which cause divisions among you contrary to the Doctrine which you have been taught, and avoid them. The works of the Flesh are manifest, which are these: ——Hatred, variance, emulation, wrath, strife, seditions, heresies, envyings, Murders. ——They that do these things shall not inherit the Kingdom of God. Put them in mind that they be subject to Principalities and Powers, that they obey Magistrates, be ready to every good work: that they speak evil of no man: that they be no brawlers, (fighters) but gentle (soft) shewing all meekness to all men: Obey them that have the rule over you, and submit your selves. Where envying and strife is, there is confusion and every evil work. Submit your selves to every Ordinance of man for the Lords sake, whether unto the King as Supreme,*

or to Governours as to those that are sent by him for the punishment of evil doers. Honour all men: Love the brotherhood. Fear God: Honour the King. Servants be subject to your Masters with all fear, not only to the good and gentle, but also to the froward. Let none of you suffer as a murderer, or as a Thief, or an evil-doer, or as a busie-body in other mens matters, &c. What thinkest thou *J. C.* Do these and the like Scriptures press any point of internal renovation, and the new birth, and the power of Christianity, or no? Is the Presbyterian party perswaded of the heavenliness and spirituality of this Doctrine? or do they account it περισσόν τι to love their enemies, to bless such as curse them, to do good to those that hate them, to pray for such as despitefully use them and persecute them? Hath their practice manifested that they esteem this imitation of the divine goodness a piece of holy singularity? Hath their way here in *England* been none other than the life and power of that part of the Law of Christ? Have they accounted it a part of holy circumspection to redeem time in evil days? to purchase to themselves a longer time to do good in by all just complyances, by honest actions, by a fair civil carriage, a peaceable conversation, by bending in all those flexures of fortune and condition which they cannot help? (*See Dr.* Taylor's *Sermon on* Mat. 10. 16.) Or have they acted as if they believed these other passages of Scripture to be divinely inspired? *If any man will come after me let him deny himself and*

and take up his Cross and follow me: Except you be converted and become as little children (in all humility and subjection) ye shall not enter into the Kingdom of Heaven: Take my yoke upon you: Learn of me for I am meek and lowly in heart: If when you do well and suffer for it, ye take it patiently, this is acceptable with God. Christ hath suffered for us leaving us an example that we should follow his steps; who when he was reviled, reviled not again, when he suffered he threatned not. ---In the last days perilous times shall come, for men shall be lovers of themselves, covetous, boasters, proud, cursed speakers, false accusers, intemperate, fierce, despisers of them that are good, traytors, heady, high-minded, ---having a Form of Godliness, but denying the power thereof, from such turn away. We beseech you brethren that you study to be quiet and to meddle with your own business. ---If any man love life, and would see good days, let him refrain his Tongue from evil, and his lips that they speak no guile, let him seek peace and ensue it. Follow peace with all men, and holiness, without which no man shall ever see the Lord. The fruit of the spirit is love, peace, long-suffering, meekness, gentleness. Now speak out man, is this pure spiritual heavenly Doctrine or no? Is the practising of it a duty incumbent upon all that would testifie themselves internally renewed, or is it not? Is the contrary neglect an argument of an unregenerate person? were these things written by the Pen-men of Scripture with such Authority and Majesty, as to beget in Presbyterians a disposition

and practice in any tolerable measure thereunto conformable? If this Author has the confidence to answer in favour of Presbyterians, let him evince or at least endeavour to evince that their Covenanting to overthrow things legally established, their reproaching those that would have upheld them as Malignants, Incendiaries, and Evil Instruments, their choosing to take up Swords into their hands rather than the Cross: their being so far from submitting to the King as supreme, and the Governours sent by him, that they resisted and maintained a long War against both. Let him, I say, evince that such ways as these are the life and power of that pure spiritual and heavenly Doctrine taught in Scripture, and owned by all true English Protestants. Nor let him be angry that I handle him in this manner, and reply thus particularly to his ambiguous generalities; since the question now being *Whether Presbyterians are the best English Protestants, and whether on that account they ought in justice or reason of State to be encouraged*; It concerned him, if he meant to discourse pertinently and clearly, to manifest that they practically own those pure spiritual and heavenly Aphorisms in particular which so much conduce to the peace of the State, and the preservation of the Order and Government by Law established; and that they heartily acknowledge and embrace all that English Protestant Doctrine which is subservient to that end; for otherwise the encouraging, yea tolerating of them will probably prove pernicious to the State.

To

To affirm that *the Presbyterian Interest is one chief strength of the true Reformed Protestant Religion*, p. 35. (45.) is much easier than to prove it.

Let those well known Principles, says he, *which strike to the heart of Popery, be brought forth for evidence: viz.* 1. *The perfection of holy Scripture, in opposition to unwritten Tradition.* 2. *The Authority of Canonical Books in opposition to the encroachments of the Apocrypha.* 3. *The distinct Knowledge of the Doctrine of Salvation according to every mans capacity in opposition to implicit Faith.* 4. *The reasonable serving of God according to the Word in opposition to blind devotion.* 5. *Spiritual Gospel-worship in opposition to a pompous train of Ceremonies.* 6. *The efficacious edifying use of Religious exercises in opposition to the Popish Opus operatum, or work done.* 7. *The power of Godliness in opposition to splendid formality.*

A. 1. I deny this Argument; The Presbyterians acknowledge the Truth of these Principles; therefore that Party is one chief strength of the true reformed Protestant Religion; for either, 1. they may own other Principles also which contradict these, and consequently weaken that Religion: or 2. they may own together with these such principles as are inconsistent with other parts of the Protestant Faith (grounded on and actuated by those Scriptures before mentioned) and with the English Protestant Doctrine by Law establisht conform to them. 2. Perhaps those

seven Principles, as those many Presbyterians understand them, who are said to account our Ceremonies unlawful, are no part of the English Protestant Doctrine; but supposing they are rightly understood, with due limitations and explications, they are not all the parts of the Protestant Doctrine, nor the chief parts of it, *as it refers to Government and Obedience*, which yet should have been most of all considered in the discussion of this Question. 3. Independents, Anabaptists, yea, Socinians do as heartily embrace all those Principles as Presbyterians, therefore he may as rationally conclude, that those also are chief supporters of the true reformed Protestant Religion, and consequently to be protected and encouraged in this Kingdom. 4. Presbytery may be extinguisht, and yet these seven Principles (understood in *sano sensu*) may be asserted by Prelatists, and consequently the State of *England* may continue Protestant without Presbyterian aids. That Prelatical men assert them as well as Presbyterians, this Author denies not; only he seems willing, *p.* 36. (46.) to have it believed that the Presbyterian Party is [more] rooted and grounded in those principles, which for my part I am ready to believe when I see it proved. But 1. This implies that Prelatists also are rooted and grounded in those Principles. Whence it follows, that *England* may keep her self pure from *Romish* abominations, though Prelatists only be protected and encouraged by her. 2. Till I see the contrary proved, I believe that Prelatists

are

are more deeply rooted and grounded than Presbyterians in those and other Protestant Principles, *so far as they are by Law establisht among us*; in which sence they *sufficiently strike at the heart of Popery*, even by this Authors own confession, *p.* 34. (44.) where he assures us (if we may rely on his bare word) that, *Let but the Protestant Doctrine* [*as 'tis by Law establisht*] *in the Church of* England, *be upheld and preached, and twill raise up a genuine off-spring of* [*sound Protestants*;] and therefore *England* may continue Protestant, though Prelatists only are encouraged, and Presbyterians rooted out; which therefore may be done in Justice and Reason of State, notwithstanding this Argument to the contrary.

As for his story, *p.* 37. (47.) I observe, 1. that the English Roman Catholicks are called a Faction in Religion, which is strange language from the Pen of a *Venetian* Agent. 2. That the Agent look'd not upon Puritans as Protestants, which as this Author tells us, *p.* 38. the *Presbyterians complain of as a palpable injury, and give evident proof, that they of right have as much Interest in that venerable Name as English Prelatists.* Now really I am much of his mind in this particular, if by Protestants he mean such as approve of Subjects protesting against the will and pleasure of their Soveraign; and such as deny obedience to the Edicts and commands of Kings and Emperors, or lawful Superiors: and if Romanizing spirits call this Puritanism, perhaps he well observes, *p.* 39.

(49.) that the more primitive times of Protestantism were more leaning to it: (I add, than they should have been) and I hope Puritans have a greater portion of those venerable qualities than Prelatists: But if he mean by Protestants such as practically own the truth of the English Protestant Doctrine, by Law established in the Church of *England*, (in which sence I suppose the *Venetian* Agent implicitly denied Puritans to be Protestants) I acknowledge the name of Protestant in that notion venerable, (since in that notion 'tis a part of Christianity) and shall be very glad if this Author can produce any evident proofs, that the Presbyterians have any right to and interest in that name; which till he do, he must pardon me if I suspend my assent, since himself has given another character of them, *p.* 22. and 29. (32. and 39.) and if he had not, their practises, especially of late years, too evidently prove them to be creatures hugely differing from true English Protestants; forasmuch as the Discipline of the Church of *England* excludes such Animals from its Communion.

Watson in his second *Quodlibet* and first Article, proposes this Question: [*Whether the Jesuits or Puritans be more dangerous, pernicious and noisom to the Commonwealth of* England, Scotland, *or any other Realm where both or either of them live, together or apart.*] He answers thus: [*The Jesuits without all question are more dangerous; not that their Doctrine is as yet so absurd as the Puritans ---- in matters pertaining to Manners, Government*

vernment and Order of Life, nor that their Intent is manifested as yet to be more malicious against both Church, Commonwealth, Prince and Peer than the Puritans are; but because the means and their manner of proceeding is more covert, more seeming substantial, more formal and orderly in it self, and therefore are the more dangerous, because of the two they are more like to prevail, by managing of whatsoever they take in hand; and the rather, for that their grounds are more firm, their perswasions more plausible, their performance more certain, as having many singular fine wits among them; whereas the Puritans have none but Grossum Caputs ... *so that if matters come to hearing and handling between Jesuits and Puritans, the latter are sure to be ridden like Fools, and come to wrack.*

In the second Article the same Author proposes this Question: [*Whether the Jesuits Doctrine abstracted from matters of Faith and Religion come nearer in matters of life and manners to the Protestants or to the Puritans.*] His Answer whereunto is: [*That Jesuits are in this respect all wholly Puritans, and therefore,* says he, *do some for distinctions-sake call the one Puritan-Papists, and the other Puritan-Protestants.*] Then he lays down a parallel between the Jesuits and the Puritans in twenty five particulars: *Some whereof are, That they agree in calling themselves the Saintly-brotherhood, in scoffing, scolding, and ignominious disgracing speeches, (Puritans against the Bishops and English Clergie, Jesuits against the Bishops and Prelates of* Rome) *in refusing to have any Superiors,*

periors, ---- in acknowledging no obedience (due, I suppose he means) *to any Ecclesiastical dignity, though dissemblingly they will yield it. The Puritans labour to pull all Bishops down, and to have none but Superintendents in* England, *and have already made havock of all such in* Scotland ; *and the Jesuits will let no Bishops be in either Realm, if they can keep them from the superiority over them. The Jesuits check and controul both Pope and Prince, as at least their equals ; and the Puritans controul both Princes and Prelates, as if they were their superiors, &c.*] At last he concludes, *that the Jesuits and Puritans do come nearest together in platforms, though both opposite one to another in intention as far as may be.*

The use that may be made of these passages is this : since the Puritans of former times were (if these pictures of them be rightly drawn) of such an ugly complexion, 'tis no great wonder, 1. That *the hatred of Prelatical Protestants against Puritans was* (as that *Venetian* Agent observes) *greater than against Catholicks*, (those Catholicks, I presume he means, who were of the *Widdringtonian* perswasion, in reference to the obedience due from subjects to Kings and Princes ;) for the *Widdringtonian* Catholicks were more opposite to those Jesuitical principles and practices which are so prejudicial to the Authority of Kings and Princes, than such Puritans were. Nor is't a wonder, 2. *That the hatred of such Catholicks was greater against Puritans than against (Prelatical) Protestants* ; for such Protestants

teſtants differed from ſuch Catholicks, not ſo much about matters of Government and obedience, as matters of Faith; but ſuch Puritans were oppoſite to them in both, in a very high degree. Nor 3. was it wonderful that *the hatred of Puritans was greater againſt ſuch Catholicks than ſuch Proteſtants.* Becauſe ſuch Catholicks are more oppoſite to ſuch Puritans than Prelatical Proteſtants are; for theſe Proteſtants differ not ſo much from thoſe Puritans about matters of Faith, as of Order, Diſcipline and Government; but thoſe Catholicks differ from them in both. Nor is it ſtrange, 4. That *both ſuch Catholicks and ſuch Proteſtants did eaſily combine together for the ruine and rooting out of Puritans*: for thoſe Puritans entertained ſuch principles as were inconſiſtent with that obedience, which both ſuch Catholicks, and ſuch Proteſtants (*Widdringtonian* Catholicks, and Prelatical Proteſtants) acknowledged to be due from ſubjects to their Soveraign; upon which ſcore alſo both thoſe parties were eagerly bent againſt Jeſuits.

And now much good may theſe [notable obſervations] (out of the *Venetian* Agent's ſtory) do this Author, who, *p.* 39. (49.) thus argues: *Papiſts impoſe the name of Puritans on ſuch as retain the old Proteſtant ſpirit of antipathy to* Rome; *therefore in the Puritan party lies the heart and ſtrength of averſeneſs and enmity to the Hereſies and Idolatries of the* Roman *Church.* Which is ſo far from being (what he is pleaſed to term it) *a good Argument*, that 'tis *a mere ſophiſm*, unleſs

less he can prove that Papists [*therefore*] call some men Puritans, *viz.* merely because of their averseness to the Heresies and Idolatries of the *Roman* Church; but that they do not call any so on that ground, is evident from this, that they do not call all by that Name, who are resolute enemies to the Heresies and Idolatries of the *Roman* Church. The *Venetian* Agent by this mans own confession, *p.* 38. (48.) called that Faction in the Church of *England* [Puritans,] because *being seasoned and initiated with the Doctrine of* Calvin, *they judged the English Reformation imperfect, and so refused submission to that Form of Policy,*] *endeavouring to introduce a purer and more perfect Form of their own.* This is Puritanism in opposition to that old Protestant spirit which animated our 39. Articles, and the Canons Ecclesiastical ratified by Q. *Elizabeth* and K. *James.*

Besides, suppose there were any Truth in this assertion, that the heart and strength of averseness and enmity to the Heresies and Idolatries of the *Roman* Church lies in the Puritan party, yet unless they are enemies also to those seditious and rebellious principles maintained by some Papists, they are not true English Protestants, and consequently they deserve not to be protected and encouraged by *England's* King. ---- If mere averseness from Popish Idolatries and Innovations were a good Argument of a good Protestant, 'twould prove Socinians the best in the world.

[*Those Bishops,* said he, *in the Church of* England, *who were heartily averse from Popish Innovations,*

vations, were more benign and favourable to Puritans.]

Which signifies little, unless he could prove it true of [all] such Bishops; but it may be he understands by [Popish Innovations] either the old Ceremonies enjoyned by Law, or some new Ceremony permitted and allowed, perhaps recommended, by Law; and it had been strange, if such kind of Bishops as were heartily averse from such Ceremonies, because they fancied them Popish Innovations, should not favour Puritans. And again, If some Bishops in the Church of *England* were more benign and favourable to Puritans, 'tis no great wonder, since the same Bishops were (it seems) counted Puritan by the adverse party. Indeed both King and Bishops were more benign and favourable to many of them than they deserved; which gave them leisure and opportunity to grow numerous; to increase and strengthen their party, till at last they were too strong both for King and Bishops; for the loyal Nobility, Gentry and Commonalty; and when they had got the power in their hands, O what grateful and ingenuous returns they made them for that benignity and favour! They ruin'd the Bishops, (not sparing even those most heartily Protestant Bishops, who had been so benign and favourable to them,) they raised a War against the King; plundered, sequestred, murthered those that adhered to him, and by degrees extorted from himself such grand diminutions of his Royal Prerogative, as that they left him

him little more than the Title of a King: And are such men as these such true English Protestants, so good Christians, as that they ought in justice and reason of State to be still treated benignly and favourably? Nay rather, should not King, Nobles and Commons (*p.* 40. (50.) *remember their darling Protestantism?* I mean, *that good English Protestantism contained in the* 39. *Articles, by Law established in the Church of* England, *that true mean between Fanatick and Jesuitical Protestantism.* Should not, I say, King, Nobles and Commons remember this their darling, and in reason of State abandon that sort of persons, who have contributed so much to the destruction of it? Let them not sleep securely, while the seeds-men of the envious one sow the Tares of Division in our Field, not only to weaken and hinder, but to choak and eat out our English Protestant Faith, Order and Government: And let our gracious Soveraign still shew himself gracious where his undeserved clemency is like to produce happy (permanent) effects; but on the other side, let the mischiefs that befel his Royal Father, through the stubborn Insolency of ingrateful and disloyal Presbyterians, make him wary in time, and circumspectly provident for his own and the Kingdoms safety, lest himself also know and feel by sad experience what it is to protect and encourage Presbyterians.

P. 41. (51.) The Author takes upon him to vindicate Presbyterians from the many Calumnies with which he tells us they are loaded. The first

first that he mentions is, [*their plucking from the Civil Magistrate his power in Causes Ecclesiastical, and erecting Imperium in Imperio.*] *Which*, says he, *is a groundless and gross mistake*, and to prove it so he urges *the declared judgment of the Highest of that way according to their own words*, which are these.

[*To the Political Magistrate is allowed a Diatactick ordering regulating power about Ecclesiastical affairs in a Political way; so that he reforms the Church when corrupted in Divine Worship, Discipline or Government.*]

But notwithstanding this there may be *Imperium in Imperio*: For the Kirk may assume to themselves the power of judging whether there are such corruptions or no; and whether the Civil Magistrate reforms those corruptions in a warrantable manner or no; and consequently of checking him in both respects if he chance to judge otherwise than they do, witness the next.

[*He convenes and convocates Synods and Councils made up of Ecclesiastical Persons to advise and conclude determinatively according to the word of God, how the Church is to be reformed and refined from corruption, how to be guided and governed when reformed.*]

But notwithstanding this there may be *Imperium in Imperio*: For the Kirk may challenge to themselves a power of convening without, yea against the Civil Magistrate's command, and here they actually challenge the power of conclusively determining

termining how the Church is to be reformed and governed.

[*He ratifies and establishes within his Dominions the just and necessary Decrees of the Church in Synods and Councils by his Civil Sanction.*]

But notwithstanding this there may be *Imperium in Imperio*: For the Kirk may claim the power of determining whether its own Decrees be just and necessary or no; and of puting them in execution, though the Civil Magistrate deny to ratify them by his Civil Sanction.

[*He judges and determines definitively with a consequent and political judgment, or judgment of Discretion, concerning things judged and determined antecedently by the Church in reference to his own Act.*]

But notwithstanding this there may be *Imperium in Imperio*: For the Kirk may take upon them to controul the King (as well as private persons) if his definitive Judgment of discretion (which they allow to every [private] person, p. 20. (30.) in reference to his own act) should chance to contradict their antecedent determinations.

[*He takes care politically that even matters and Ordinances merely and formally Ecclesiastical be duly managed by Ecclesiastical Persons orderly called thereunto*]

But notwithstanding this there may be *Imperium in Imperio*: For the Kirk may imagine that in

in case the King refuse to take this Political care, themselves may appoint Ecclesiastical Persons to manage them, and that their so doing is an orderly call to those Persons to act accordingly.

[*He hath a compulsive, punitive or corrective power formally Political in matters of Religion in reference to all sorts of Persons and things under his Jurisdiction*]

But notwithstanding this there may be *Imperium in Imperio*: For holy Kirk may deny her self to be, in matters of Religion, under his Jurisdiction.

[*He may Politically compel the outward man of all Persons, Church-Officers, or others under his Dominion unto External performance of their respective duties and offices in matters of Religion, punishing them if either they neglect to do their duty at all, or do it corruptly.*]

But notwithstanding this also there may be *Imperium in Imperio*: For the Kirk may fancy themselves the only or chief Judges of what are the duties and offices belonging to such and such Persons, and whether they neglect or corruptly perform them.

So that if Presbyterians grant no more power to belong to the King of *England* in Ecclesiastical matters, they deny his Supremacy and consequently erect *Imperium in Imperio*.

How they who *give up themselves to the sole direction and Authority of the holy Scriptures*,

p. 24. (34.) can (in reason) acknowledge *a spiritual power over the Conscience as intrinsecally belonging to the Church*, I leave him to inform us; who would have us believe, *p.* 43. (53) that [*Presbyterians do not claim for the Convocation or any other Ecclesiastical Convention an Independency on Parliaments.*]

That they do not claim it for a Convocation of Bishops and Episcopal men I am apt enough to believe. But I cannot entertain any reasonable hope that they who have Covenanted so deeply in the behalf of the Scotch Discipline and Form of Government, as to swear an endeavour of reforming things in *England* according to the example of the Kirk of *Scotland*, (as one of the best reformed Churches) will acknowledge the ratification of the decrees of all Ecclesiastical conventions to depend on Parliaments. For, if Bishop *Bramhall* deceive us not, (Fair Warning *p.* 9.) 'Tis a Scotch maxime, that *Parliamentary ratifications can no way alter Church-Canons concerning the worship of God; for Ecclesiastical Discipline ought to be exercised whether it be ratified by the Civil Magistrate or not. The want of a Civil Sanction to the Church is but like lucrum cessans, not damnum emergens, as it adds nothing to it, so it takes nothing away from it: If there be any clashing of Jurisdictions, or defect in this kind, they lay the fault at the Magistrates door, accounting it a great sin or wickedness for the Magistrate to hinder the exercise or execution of Ecclesiastical Discipline. But we,* say they, *do give Christi-*

an

an Magistrates a Political power to convocate Synods, to preside in Synods, to ratify the Acts of Synods, to reform the Church; we make him the keeper of both Tables. Take nothing, says the discerning Bishop, *and hold it fast; Here are good words but they signify nothing, for they teach that this power of the Christian Magistrate is not privative and destructive to the power of the Church, but cumulative and only auxiliary or assisting:* Which very Doctrine is taught by [the highest of the Presbyterian way] here in *England* in their *Jus Divinum Regiminis Ecclesiastici*; where their concessions just now mentioned by this Author are to be found, but *p.* 77. with this restriction, *All the former power,* say they, *that is granted or may be granted circa sacra to the Magistrate, is only* [*cumulative*] *not* [*privative,*] *he may help her in Reformation, not hinder her in reforming her self, convening Synods her self, as in Act.* 15. *otherwise her condition were better without than with a Magistrate: The Christian Magistrate much less ought to prejudice her herein, otherwise her state were worst under the Christian than under the Pagan Magistrate.* Thus the Presbyterian Authors (or Author) of that Book. *Besides the power* (as the Bishop goes on) *which they abusively call authoritative, but is indeed ministerial of executing their Decrees, and contributing to their settlement; they ascribe to the Magistrate concerning the Acts of Synods* (*that which every private man hath*) *a judgment of discretion, but they retain to themselves the judgment of Jurisdi-*

on, and if he judge not as they would have him, but suspend out of conscience the influence of his Political power where they would have him exercise it, they will either teach him another part of Popery, that is, an implicit Faith, or he may perchance feel the weight of their Church-censures, and find quickly what manner of men they be, as our late gracious King Charles, *and before him his Father, his Grandmother and his great-Grandmother did all to their cost.* See more p. 11,12.

Mr. *Parker* in his discourse concerning Puritans (printed 1641) though he talk sometimes extravagantly enough in their favour, yet now and then he has his *Lucida intervalla* wherein he speaks more agreeably to Truth and Reason. Having mentioned some Tenents concerning Spiritual and Temporal Jurisdiction maintained by *that great Arch-Prelate Mr.* Calvin, p. 28. *according to the Popish Grounds*, p. 29. he tells us that *that method of Mr.* Calvin's *is the way to erect Regnum in Regno, and to maintain such concurrent Jurisdictions as cannot possibly stand together*, p. 31. *for all being subject to sin and offence as well the Spiritual as Temporal, either the one or other must go unquestioned, and this may produce division, or else both, and that will cause most certain confusion. Both sides here seem*, says he, *strangely puzzled*, (of which assertion he subjoyns not so much as a seeming reason as to the Episcopal side, but proceeds thus) *The rigidest of the Episcopal Faction allow Princes a coercive power over Priests and Prelates where they perform*

not

not what their duty is in their Functions or Jurisdictions, and this power requires an higher power of summoning, arraigning, and legally trying them; and yet the moderatest of the Presbyterian Faction would have Princes questionable, tryable, and punishable by the Spiritualty. Which sufficiently implyes that he thought not any Episcopal men guilty of that crime.

From which premisses I conclude, that notwithstanding any thing produc'd here by this Author to the contrary, this first charge against Presbyterians is a true accusation, not a calumny.

He proceeds to a second, and tells us, *p.* 43. (53.) *There goes a voice that Presbyterians are Antimonarchical,* (as if 'twere *vox & praterea nihil.*)

[*But are their Principles inconsistent with Monarchy, or any impeachment to the same? These are contained in the character above written.*]

But what if that Character of them be traiterously partial, and in reference to the Question here treated of ridiculously impertinent and abominably deceitful? whereof if this Author or any of his Brethren desire farther proof, I may chance to satisfy their desires before I conclude these Animadversions.

In the mean time let's listen to his fine Apologies.

[*Peradventure,* says he, *p.* 44. (54.) *the exact Presbytery, that is, the parity of degree and*

Authority in all Ministers is that against which this charge is directed.] Judge then whether that forementioned character, where that which is exact Presbytery is altogether concealed, be an exact description of Presbytery. [*Although this parity is not insisted on*] Was it not insisted on at the Isle of *Wight* Treaty? [*or urged to the breach of peace.*] He did [but think] p. 20. that most Presbyterians here in *England* allowed in order to peace *Episcopum Præsidem*: but here he's more peremptory, and withal (it seems) so scandalously ignorant, as to believe that Tumults, Riots, Covenanting, and fighting in the behalf of Scotch-Presbytery is no breach of peace. [*Neither is it essential to Presbytery.*] whence I gather, that exact Presbytery is not essential to Presbytery: but was it not essential to the Presbytery contended for at the Isle of *Wight?* was it not essential to that Form of Government which they had before Covenanted to introduce?

[*Yet what reason can be rendred why this may not comport with Kingly Government?*] A. Even the self-same reason which some of his own party have (as I take it) made use of, to prove that Episcopacy cannot comport with Kingly Government, *viz.* that it pretends (as some men discourse of it) to be *Jure Divino*: which since Presbyterian parity also pretends to, 'tis upon that score inconsistent with Monarchical Government, as much as Episcopacy: the argument is as good against both Forms as against either. But

2. Since this Author is guilty, either of such grosse ignorance, or such Treasonable dishonesty, as to make us believe, either that there is, or that he knows not any ground of this Accusation, but what is fetcht from the Presbyterian parity: I shall for his and other such mens better information, take the pains to transcribe part of the Answer to a Letter written at *Oxford*, and superscribed to Dr. *Samuel Turner*, concerning the Church and the Revenues thereof. *Examine*, says the Answerer, *p.*15. *the Presbyterian principles, and you will clearly find Kings and they cannot stand together; for either you consider that new Government in the Scottish sence, which allows no appeal to any other power; and then it's plain, that where men admit this they admit of a Supremacy, which doth not reside in the King, and by consequence of two several supremacies within the bounds of the self-same Kingdom, which can no more stand with Monarchy, than it can with Monogamy, to be married to two several Wives; and though 'tis said, that this Presbyterian Government meddles only with Spiritual things, which concern the good of the Soul, and so it cannot hurt Regal power, yet this is but only said and no more; for 'tis well known, that* in ordine ad spiritualia (*and all things may by an ordinary wit be drawn into this rank, as they have been by the Church of* Rome) *this Government intrudes upon what things it pleaseth: and where a supremacy is once acknowledged, no wise man can think that it will carry it self otherwise; so that King* James *his maxim was undoubt-*

edly most true, No Bishop, no King. For that most prudent Prince did soon discern, that if a power were once set up, which (as least in the legal execution of it) did not derive it self from the King, there was no doubt to be made that it would ere long destroy the very King himself. ---- Or consider the Presbyterian Government in the English sence, as it's now set up by the two Houses at Westminster, *which is a Government limited by an Appeal to the Parliament; for either by Parliament here they mean the two Houses, excluding the King, and then 'tis as plain as before, they set up two supremacies, his Majesties and their own; or else by Parliament they mean the King with both Houses; and then 'twill follow, that either there must be a perpetual Parliament (which sure the King nor Kingdom can't have cause to like) or else the supremacy will be for the most part in the Presbyters; because whenever a Parliament sits not, there will be no Judge to appeal to; or if it be said, the Parliament may leave a Standing Committee to receive Appeals in such Ecclesiastical causes, then either in this Committee the King hath no Negative; and in that case 'tis clear, that the Ecclesiastical supremacy will be not at all in the King; or else the King hath a Negative, but yet is joyned with persons whom he himself chuseth not, and so most probably will be chek'd and affronted in any sentence he intends to give; and this clearly overthrows that which is already declared by Parliament to be a right in the King, as inherent in his Crown, that Ecclesiastical Appeals may be made to him alone in*

Chancery,

Chancery, (for the Statute names no other) *and that his Majesty alone may appoint what Commissioners he pleases for their final decision: I say consider the Presbyterian Government in the English Parliament sence, and in the sence of the English Assembly, (for the Presbyterians there are wholly for the Scottish Form, as appears by their quarrels at what the Houses have already done in their Ordinances,) and twill appear that their aim is not only to set up a new Government, but in plain terms, a new Supremacy: and hence, to say truth, he must see very little, who discerns not, that though the Presbyterian party seems to strike at the Bishops, yet their main aim is at the King, whose supremacy they endure not, as being a flower which they intend for their own Garland; and so though they hypocritically cry out (that they may abuse the people) against the pride of the Lordly Bishops, yet in the mean time the wiser sort must needs see that they intend to make themselves no less than indeed Kingly Presbyters.* Thus he: And if this Author thinks this reasoning insufficient to prove Presbytery Antimonarchical, let him tell us why.

In the mean time it follows, *p.* 44. (54.) [*Or would this sort of men* [*Presbyterians*] *have no King to reign over them?*] A. None, if he will not comply with their humours. [*Doth a Republick better please them?*] A. Not an Independent or Anabaptistical Republick; but time hath been when a Presbyterian Republick (some parcels of the two Houses) did please them far better than an Episcopal King.

[*Did*

[*Did the English or Scottish Presbyters ever go about to dissolve Monarchy, and to erect some other kind of Government? In no wise,* quoth he; *for in the Solemn League and Covenant they bound themselves to endeavour the preservation of the Kings person and Authority, and declared they had no intent to diminish his Majesties just power and greatness.*] (Of the justness of which power themselves would be judges: But) did not all Covenanters do so as well as Presbyterians? The man sure would make us believe, either that our Monarchy was not dissolved (and another kind of Government erected) or else that 'twas done by some that were not Covenanters. For why is not this Argument as good? Independents Covenanted to preserve the Kings person and Authority: Therefore they never went about to dissolve Monarchy? This is a much better consequence: Neither the English nor Scottish Presbyterians endeavoured to preserve the Kings Authority, just power and greatness, (the Justness whereof must be judged of by Law, not by the dictates of insolent minds puft up with prosperity) therefore either they never bound themselves and intended to preserve it, or else they practised contrary to those obligations and intentions. If he has the confidence to deny the Antecedent, I may chance to evince it to him before we part. Indeed his next words suggest a very considerable proof of it.

[*After the violent change of Government, they* (*the Presbyterians*) *came slowest, and envied latest*

latest into those new Engagements imposed by the Usurpt powers.] Which is an implicit confession: 1. That those Engagements were inconsistent with fidelity to Monarchical Government, and the Kings Authority. 2. That yet at last the Presbyterians did enter into them; whence I gather, 1. That whereas the third Article of the Covenant obliged them to endeavour (*not only sincerely, but also*) *constantly* (*with their Estates and Lives*) *to preserve and defend the Kings Majesties Authority, just power, and greatness*; they ceased to do so at last, when they entred upon those new Engagements, and consequently did then break their Covenant. And 2. That the Presbyterians are not such fixt and unalterable Creatures (as he would needs have perswaded us, *p.* 29. (39.) they are) since they did upon changes in Government vary by degrees from themselves, and either deserted those principles which kept them from engaging with the foremost, or else contradicted them by engaging at last though slowly. And truly that they did so is tacitly acknowledged by this Author, *p.* 45. (55.) where he tells us, that [*the generality of conscientious Presbyterians never ran with the current of those times*;] which sadly implies, either that the generality of Presbyterians were not conscientious, since they generally ran with the current at last, or that some conscientious Presbyterians did, notwithstanding the dictates of their conscience, run with the current; For either he must mean, that the generality of Presbyterians [otherwise conscientious]

ſcientious] did [in that particular] by an error of Conſcience run with the current; but this ſeems not to have been this Authors meaning, for then it follows (by his own confeſſion) that the generality of them were deluded by an erroneous Conſcience into a breach of Covenant, which yet this paſſage is brought to abſolve them from; or elſe they muſt mean that ſome Presbyterians conſcientious in this particular alſo, did run with the current, and then it follows that though they were conſcious of their duty to the contrary, yet they did engage notwithſtanding that practical dictate.

His following Apologeticks are theſe, 1. *That the Scotch Presbyterians adventured no more than all to uphold our Soveraign that now is.*] Did they adventure ſo much as all? 2. [*That when he fell, it was ſaid by the adverſary, Presbytery was fallen.*] No wonder if Scots adventured much to uphold that King whom they believed willing to uphold their Presbytery. 3. [*That keeping company with the chief Presbyterian Miniſters, was objected by the Republican Council of State, as a crime cauſing* (meritoriouſly I ſuppoſe he means) *impriſonment.*] It may be they were ſome ſuch Presbyterian Miniſters as had quite forgotten the obligation that was upon them (by their entring into the Engagements aforeſaid) to be true and faithful to a Common-wealth-Form. And when they ſaw themſelves like enough to be dealt with by other Sectaries, as themſelves had dealt with the Epiſcopal

pal party, began to bethink themselves whether they had not in the days of Yore entred into a Covenant to preserve and defend the King's Majesties Person and Authority in this Nation, and to act as if they thought themselves obliged thereby against a Republican Form. 4. [*That the Presbyterians by their influence first divided and then dissipated the Sectarian party, and so made way for his Majesties return in peace.*] That Presbyterians have, where they are protected and encouraged, a faculty of dividing first and then dissipating, I am not so envious as to deny: But 1. Either they had lost this faculty in *Oliver*'s time, or else they were very loth to exert it in the behalf of his Majesty; the visible reason whereof was because *Cromwell* tolerated them in their Form of worship, and did so far protect and encourage them, as to continue them in those places of profit and preferment out of which they would very probably have been ejected by those Sectarians, who afterwards domineered. 2. That 'twas the Presbyterian influence which wrought those blessed effects among them whom he calls the Sectarian party, I would fain see him prove, and when he has done that, he would do me another favour if he would tell me why he calls that party (which he speaks of as divided and dissipated) *Sectarian*, but let him take heed lest he do it upon such grounds as being applyed to *Presbyterians* will prove them also *Sectarians*. 5. [*That 'tis acknowledged by some eminent on the Episcopal side, that the sense of the Covenant hath*

hath lately quickned many mens Consciences in their Allegiance to the King, so as to bring him with David *home in infinite Joy and Triumph.*] Their consciences it seems were a long time dead and callous; why did not the sense of their Covenant animate them when our Soveraign was at *Worcester* to preserve and defend with their Estates and Lives his Majesties Person and Authority? From these premises he concludes that [*They are not averse from Regal Government or the Royal Family; but they desire to dwell under the shadow of our dread Soveraign,* (*but* mark the following words) *hoping to revive as the Corn, and to grow as the Vine under his gracious Influence*] I doubt the man hath unawares discovered the chief ground of Presbyterians Loyalty (at least if instead of the Corn and Vine he had said the Ivy, and expressed himself thus, *hoping to grow as the Ivy under the gracious influence of the Oak* (which at last kills the Oak that protected and nourished it.) For my part I never thought Presbyterians averse from any Regal Government that would advance their Party; or from the Royal Family, if they believed that that family would secure their designs: they were willing enough that Monarchy should revive and flourish, and that in the Royal Line, on supposition and in hopes that Presbytery would revive and flourish together with it; otherwise our experience sufficiently informs us, that *two Houses* (as I intimated before) pleas'd them better than *a King*, and *Richard Cromwell* than *Charles the Second*. Possibly

sibly if these Vines meet with a dread Soveraign whose Influence is so gracious to them as to set up Presbytery by a Law, they will afford some pleasing Juice; but if they Imagine not his Influence gracious, they will degenerate into the Plant of a strange Vine; and he shall receive no fruit from them but sour Grapes and the bitter Clusters of *Gomorrha*. They desire, 'tis true, to dwell under the shadow of this Royal Tree, if so be they may confidently promise themselves that under his shadow they shall live and thrive among the Christian Sectaries and Heathen* Prelatists. But if not, 'tis to be feared that Fire will come out of these Brambles and devour the Cedar of Lebanon; that they will again pray and preach, and when they have opportunity fight against him till the breath of our nostrils, the Anointed of the Lord, *Charles* the Second be also taken in their Pits. If his shadow prove as offensive to them as that of some Trees in *Asia*, which Doves delight in, is said to be to Serpents, they will lop off all its displeasing branches, and so make way for others to lay the Ax to the root of the Tree.

* *Consider, O Lord, that they are a faction principally of some few Persons, as the Prelates, that have caus'd such confusions in the Land; and wilt thou destroy the righteous with the wicked? Far be it from thee, and even now do not thy people lift up strong cries unto thee against their* [*Egyptian*] *Taskmasters and* [*Babylonian*] *Lords?*

So Brother *Burton*'s Holy Breathings, in the Consultation prefixt to his Reply to Archbishop *Laud*'s book against *Fisher*.

[*Per-*

[*Peradventure, p.* 46. (56.) *They would enervate Monarchy and render it too impotent; surely I cannot find the rise of this objection, unless from hence, that they are not willing to come under any yoke but that of the Laws of the Realm, or to pay arbitrary Taxes levyed without consent of Parliament.*]

Certes this man talks sometimes as if he were newly come out of his mothers womb; as if he were of yesterday and knew nothing, or else as if he hoped to meet with no Readers but such as would be either so credulous as to believe every thing he is audacious enough to say, or so ignorant as to be altogether unacquainted with the Principles and practices of Presbyterians. But since he sometimes seems to have heard of a thing called [*The Solemn League and Covenant*] and besides that, hath probably seen and read it, yea and possibly hath been so unhappy as to take it, I desire to know why he could not there find ground enough for that objection. Let him tell us, 1. Why they who swear to endeavour the preservation of the Scotch Discipline and Government, which so manifestly erects *Imperium in Imperio*, may not justly be looked upon as men that would enervate Monarchy and render it too impotent, in *Scotland*? 2. Why they who swear to endeavour to bring the Churches of God in *England*, *Scotland* and *Ireland* to Uniformity in Discipline and Church-Government, and consequently to endeavour the Introduction of that Scotch Form of Church-Government into *England*, may

may not justly be looked upon as men that would enervate Monarchy in *England* also, and render it too impotent by setting up there also *Imperium in Imperio?* 3. Why they who swear the extirpation of Prelacy, that is, Church-Government by Archbishops, Bishops &c. may not justly be look'd upon as men that would enervate the power of that Monarchy which esteems that Form of Church-Government as a very considerable support and strengthening to it: Witness the Aphorism of that wise Monarch King *James*, *No Bishop no King*, the truth whereof King *Charles* found by sad experience. *4. Why they who when they had power in their hands constrained our former Soveraign to grant such Propositions as left him only a titular Kingship, may not justly be look'd upon as persons that would whensoever 'tis in their power again enervate Monarchy and render it too impotent? When he hath given a satisfactory answer to these Queries I may possibly trouble him with some more of the like import; for I believe there are so many grounds of making this objection that (in probability) the only reason why this Author could find no other rise of it than what he mentions, was because he would not seek it.

* *Dum Episcoporum Jurisdictionem invadunt (Anarchæ) caveant Principes. Scitè admodum monet Poeta, Tunc tua res agitur paries cum proximus ardet; ubi enim Episcoporum ditio expugnanda obsidetur, ibidem proximè imo potissimè in Regum Principatus irruptio tentabitur.* S. Clara Apolog. Episc. p. 20.

F That

That which he is pleased to mention (as the rise) is, [*That the Presbyterians were not willing, 1. To come under any Yoke but that of the Laws of the Realm: Or 2. To pay arbitrary Taxes levied without consent of Parliament.*]

To the 1. (hoping that (whatsoever this Authors words imply to the contrary) they were willing to come under the Yoke of the Laws of God also (at least such of them as they thought would not lie too heavy upon their Necks) I answer, 1. If they had been willing to come under the Yoke of the Laws of the Realm, they would long ago have ceased to be Presbyterians; that is, shakers off of the yoke of Prelacy and Ceremonies establisht by those Laws. 2. If they had been unwilling to come under any other yoke, they would not have come under the yoke of the Covenant, since it was not injoyned by any Law of the Realm. 3. They have not shewed themselves willing to come under the yoke of the Oath of Supremacy, (imposed by Law) since they have been far from a practical acknowledgment, that the King of *England* is the only Supreme Governour of this Realm, and all other his Dominions and Countries in all Spiritual or Ecclesiastical things or Causes; and that the reforming, ordering, corrrecting of them, is by a Statute 1. *Eliz.* for ever united and annexed to the Imperial Crown of this Realm; but on the contrary themselves usurpt the power of reforming, ordering, correcting them without, yea, against his consent; and in so doing they enervated our Monarchy,

Monarchy, and rendred it too impotent in a chief part of its Prerogative; nay, too many of them are so far from acknowledging the Kings Supremacy in their actions, that they refrain even from a verbal acknowledgment of it in their prayers; for when they pray for the King they make a halt at the end of those words [*Defender of the Faith,*] as if the confessing him Supreme Head in all Ecclesiastical causes, and over all Ecclesiastical persons, were either Error, Heresie, or a piece of Treason.

To the 2. I answer, by demanding, 1. Whether there be not as much (if not more) Law for the Kings imposing Taxes (in some cases) without the consent of Lords Temporal and Commons, than there is for [their] imposing them without the Kings consent. 2. Whether the King and his Privy Council are not more competent Judges of the exigency of times and cases (in reference to such impositions) than Presbyterian subjects? 3. Whether any Law of the Land forbids the payment of Taxes imposed by the King, without consent of the three Estates, (*viz.* Lords Spiritual, Temporal, and Commons?) 4. Whether it does not equally forbid the payment of Taxes imposed by the three Estates (and much more by two only) without the King? 5. Whether Presbyterians were not willing enough to pay arbitrary Taxes to the Presbyterian Lords Temporal and Commons, though levied without the Kings consent, and therefore without consent of Parliament? and consequently,

ly, whether that be not false which this Author tells us, that they were not willing to pay Taxes levied without consent of Parliament? 6. Whether in so doing they did not abundantly manifest, that 'twas not the arbitrariness of the Taxes, but either their being imposed by the King, or else their being imposed to such ends as did not serve the Presbyterian Interest; that was the main reason of their quarrelling with, and contending against those Impositions. 'Tis therefore too evident, that the Presbyterians had a design to enervate our English Monarchy; since, though they refused not to pay arbitrary Taxes to some Lords Temporal and Commons, levied without the Kings consent, and on purpose to carry on a War against him, yet they were unwilling to pay arbitrary Taxes to the King, though levied for the defence of his person and Authority, because levied without consent of Parliament.

Upon which pretence also their great Advocate Mr. *Prynne* would fain have perswaded them to deny the payment of the Assessments imposed by those powers that routed the Presbyterian Lords and Commons. That Author in his Reasons why he would not pay Taxes, (*viz.* to the Independent Lords and Commons) tells us, *p.* 1. That *by the Fundamental Laws and known Statutes of this Realm, no Tax, Tallage, Aid, Imposition, Contribution, Loan or Assessment whatsoever may, or ought to be imposed or levied on the Free-men and people of this Realm of* England, *but by the will and common assent of the Earls, Barons, Knights, Burgesses,*

Burgeſſes, Commons and whole Realm, in a free and full Parliament, by Act of Parliament, all Taxes not ſo impoſed and levied, though for the common defence and profit of the Realm, being unjuſt, oppreſſive, &c. This is ſound Doctrine, it ſeems, when Independents domineer, but in the time of the Presbyterian Tyranny Taxes might be impoſed and levied by ſome Lords Temporal and Commons only, without Act of Parliament, and yet not be accounted either unjuſt, or oppreſſive, or inconſiſtent with the Liberty of the Subject. The reaſon was, becauſe Presbyterian ambition was cheriſh'd and gratified by thoſe Taxes, which it ceaſed to be when Independents had the chief power of impoſing them.

And yet we are told in the next lines, that [*none more reverence their Liberties, and value the native happineſs of the Free-born Subjects of* England (than Presbyterians.)] But what, I pray Sir, was in point of State-affairs the native happineſs of Engliſh men, (that had ſo much happineſs as to be born before Presbyterians began to domineer) was it not that they were born ſubjects to a Soveraign to whom belonged the ordering of the *Militia* at all times, a negative Voice in Parliament, the Supreme power in Eccleſiaſticals as well as Civils? and members of that Nation where the only legal Form of Church-Government was by Archbiſhops, Biſhops, Deans, Archdeacons, Chancellors, Commiſſaries, *&c.* Where an excellent Liturgy was commanded to be uſed, and no other Form of Di-

vine Service permitted by Law? Where the Ceremonies of the Surplice, Croſs in Baptiſm, Kneeling at the Sacrament, were (for order and decencies-ſake) appointed by the Church-Governors, and the uſe of them enjoyned by Law? Is this the *native happineſs* that Presbyterians valued? Or does the man mean by [*native happineſs*] their receiving the temper of their bodies from predominant choler, phlegm or black melancholy? and the complexion of their Souls (*from Heaven ſhall I ſay?* 'twould puzzle S. *Auſtin* himſelf to determine; I confeſs I am ſomewhat apt to believe that Presbyterians Souls are rather) *ex traduce*; from the prolifical, aſſimilating vertue of the Parents ſpirit, which being immerſed in *Hyle*, and over-charged with ugly humors, is ſo far from generating a Platonical Soul, made up of Harmony, that its off-ſpring does more reſemble *Galen*'s dull conceit of the eſſence of all Souls, and is of ſo baſe an alloy, that it little differs from a vicious, malign temperament of body: I confeſs, I think none do more value [*this*] *native happineſs* than [*theſe*] *Free-born ſubjects of* England, but whether there are none that more reverence their Liberties, let the world judge, by their frequent meriting ſevere reſtraints for their ſeditious and ſchiſmatical breaches of the Laws of *England*; by their paying arbitrary Taxes levied without conſent of King, Lords and Commons, ('tis an Argument good enough *ad hominem*) by their ſwearing to ſubmit their necks to the yoke of *Scotch* Diſcipline

pline and Government, not allowed of by any Law of this Realm; was this to revere their Liberties? or rather to prostitute them to the lusts of those men, whose spirit breathed nothing more than contradiction both to mans Law and Christs Gospel; to Civil constitutions and to the maxims of Christian Religion.

For whereas this Author, *p.* 47. (57.) talks of their true knowledge and sence of the nature of Christian Religion, and that this makes a due civil Freedom exceeding precious to them, 1. As I intimated before, 'tis not a due freedom from illegal Impositions, that the Religion of these professing Christians makes so precious to them; for to be inslaved to Presbyterian Impositions, though illegal, is very grateful to them; but 'tis a liberty from Episcopal Impositions and Royal Sanctions, and such Taxations (whether legal or illegal) *as are not designed for the advancement of their interest*, which they so highly value; and therefore 'tis manifest enough, they plead for such a liberty as will enfeeble our English Monarchy. 2. I much question, whether their high valuation of freedom from illegal Taxes, and their unwillingness to pay them, can (in reason) proceed from any true knowledge and sence of the nature of Christian Religion. For I desire to know of them, whether (at least in case our Laws do not expressly forbid our payment of Taxes, imposed by the King out of Parliament) our Saviours precept, *Matth.* 5. 42. *Give to him that asketh, and from him that would borrow of thee, turn not away*;

and his own practice, *Matth.* 17. 27. paying tribute for himself and S. *Peter*, merely *lest he should offend the* exactors, who ought not to have demanded it *of the children, v. 26. that were all free, but only of strangers*: I desire, I say, to know of them, whether that precept and this practice do not oblige all English men that profess Christianity, to pay Taxes quietly and patiently, though levied by the King alone without Law? 3. On this occasion I shall take leave to question, whether these Free-born subjects had indeed a true knowledge and sense of the Nature of Christian Religion in other particulars, as well as this; for if they had, would not their practice have been more conformable to it? (if at least that Axiom be true, *Voluntas necessario sequitur dictamen Intellectus practicum*, which those among them that do not Arminianize hold for a truth.) But whether their practises have been conform to the dictates of that Religion, let any one who knows those dictates, consider and judge impartially. They speak such language as this; *Blessed are the meek*, *Matth.* 5. 5. (who rather would suffer all injuries than revenge themselves) *Blessed are the peace-makers*, v. 9. *Resist not evil. Whosoever shall smite thee on the right cheek, turn to him the other also*, v. 39. (rather receive double wrong than revenge thine own griefs) *Love your enemies; bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them that despitefully use you and persecute you*, v. 44. *Judge not that you be not judged*, Chap. 7. 1. (be not curi-

ous

ous or malicious to try out and condemn your neighbours faults —— for Hypocrites hide their own faults, and seek not to amend them, but are curious to reprove other mens.) *Whatsoever you would that men should do unto you, do you also unto them,* v. 12. *Beware of false Prophets, which come to you in sheeps clothing, but inwardly they are ravening Wolves,* v. 15. *Be you wise as Serpents, and innocent as Doves,* Chap. 10. 16. (not revenging, much less doing wrong) *Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsars, and unto God the things that are Gods,* Chap. 22. 21. *The Scribes and Pharisees sit in* Moses's *seat. All therefore whatsoever they bid you observe, that observe and do,* Chap. 23. 2, 3. *Put up thy sword into his place,* (the exercise of the sword is forbid to private persons) *for all that take the sword shall perish by the sword,* Chap. 26. 52. *When you stand and pray, forgive, if you have any thing against any man, that your Father also which is in Heaven may forgive your trespasses,* Mark 11.25. *Condemn not and you shall not be condemned. Forgive and you shall be forgiven,* Luke 6. 37, *&c.* If Presbyterian actions had been conformable to these and other Christian principles, their Pamphlets would have been freer from railing and reviling; their Sermons from inflaming mens spirits, and kindling in them the fires of disloyal Jealousie; their discourse from censorious judging and condemning their brethren; and their understandings freer from pernicious errors, than for ought appears by their pernicious actions, they were;

were: They had neither run themselves into danger rashly and unnecessarily at first, nor afterwards by unlawful means preserved themselves from a legal Trial, and the stroke of Justice for those misdemeanors. But when resisting evil, and those that offer it, can be reconciled with not resisting it or them, and with the suffering of real and much more pretended injuries: When raising War against our Royal Soveraign, and continuing it for several years, can justly be interpreted making peace: When the applying, *Curse ye Meroz*, yea curse ye bitterly the Inhabitants thereof, *Judg.* 5. 23. to those that came not forth to fight against the King and his loyal subjects, can consist with blessing and praying for those that are suppoled despitefully to use and persecute us: when Dove-like harmlesness and Wolfish cruelty cease to be contradictories: when to wrest the power of the *Militia* out of the Kings hands, and to deny him his Negative voice, is to render to *Cæsar* the things that are *Cæsar*'s: when Covenanting against Prelacy and our Church-Discipline, and Orders, is all one with the observing and doing what our lawful Governours require: when putting up our swords into their sheaths, and loving, doing good to, and forgiving our enemies, is compatible with reproaching their persons, with ruining themselves and their Families, with turning them out of their legal possessions, with plundering their Goods, sheathing swords into their bowels, and spilling their innocent and loyal bloud; then, and not

till

till then will Presbyterian practises be reconcileable with Christ's precepts, and agreeable to that Religion which he taught the world, and which (as this Author well observes) *is not variable according to the will of man, but indispensably binds every Soul, and is grounded upon an unchangeable, eternal Truth*; (which if the English Independent *J. Goodwin*, or *Bucanan* the Scotch Presbyterian had believed heretofore, they had not made such an ugly Fanatick Apology as they did, for subjects taking up Arms against and murdering their Soveraign;) and if the Presbyterian professors of this Religion, and of their own true knowledge and sense of the Nature of it, had acted suitably to such a profession, they had never thought it expedient to reduce his late Majesty to such dismal straits at the Isle of *Wight*, where they constrained him to grant them so much liberty, as miserably enfeebled the Monarchical and Legal power of the Kings of *England*; whereby (whatsoever he cants in the following lines of *a King's ruling over a free people*) Presbyterians have sufficiently taught us, that they take more delight in making good Kings their slaves, than in manifesting themselves to be good subjects. [*To be a powerful Monarch*, says he, *p.* 48. *over a free people, is the freedom and glory of our Soveraign Lord, above all the Potentates of the Earth.*] The more disloyal creatures were those Presbyterians, who in that fatal Isle treated with such a Soveraign Lord, and once

De jure Regni, p. 50, 55.

once powerful Monarch, to such bad purposes, as to despoil him of his Royal Freedom and Glory; and by their imperious demands to dwindle this potent and glorious Monarchy into a slavish, ignoble, titular Kingship; whence we may conjecture what a licentious, treasonable liberty it is, that such Free-born subjects breath after, and how insolently they'l again exercise it (over our Soveraign Lord the King) if by his Majesties connivence and indulgence they meet with the like opportune advantages of winding themselves by degrees into the like power.

From which premises I conclude, that notwithstanding any thing produced here by this Author to the contrary, this second Charge against the Presbyterians [that they are Anti-Monarchical] is a true accusation, not a calumny.

The third Calumny (as he calls it) with which Presbyterians are loaded, is the charge of Disobedience and Rebellion: [*and this*, says our Author, *were a crying sin indeed*] But yet he thinks it necessary to speak something Apologetical, at least to mitigate the business, and remove prejudice; and therefore, *p.* 49. he tells us, [*The Presbyterian party in* England *never engaged under a less Authority, than that of both Houses of Parliament.*] A. The word [*engaged*] is of dubious signification. 1. Did they never *engage, that is, subscribe the Engagement* (to be faithful to the Commonwealth, as established, without King or House of Lords) under a less Authority, than that of both Houses of Parliament?

ment? 2. Did they never *engage, that is, raise and foment jealousies against the King, reproaches against the Bishops, or preach* Division, Sedition and Schism, instead of Union, Loyalty and Obedience, under a less Authority than that of both Houses of Parliament? Nay, 3. Did they never *engage in fighting against the King* under a less Authority than that of both Houses of Parliament? Is he ignorant that two thirds and more of the Lords deserted that house because of those frequent Tumults which drave the King from *London*? and that the major part of the House of Commons left that House also for the same reasons? and that new men were chosen in their places against Law by the pretended warrant of a counterfeit Seal? Is he Ignorant that his late Majesty in a Declaration 1642. (occasioned by the Ordinance of the Lords and Commons for the assessing men a 20th part of their Estates) hath these words, *Our good Subjects will no longer look upon these and the like results, as upon the Counsels and Conclusions of both our houses of Parliament (though all the world knows even that authority can never justify things unwarrantable by Law) They well know how few of the persons trusted by them, are present at their Consultations, of above* 500 *not* 80, *and of the House of Peers not a fifth part; that they who are present enjoy not the Priviledge and Freedome of Parliament, but are besieged by an Army, and awed by the same Tumults which drave us and their Fellow-*

See Judge Jenkins's *Lex Terræ p.* 35.

Fellow-members from thence, to consent to what some few seditious schismatical persons among them do propose. Is to fight under the banner of such a minor part of both Houses or of the superinduced major part *illegally* chosen, to engage under no less Authority than that of both Houses of Parliament? nay, not only *illegally* but *treasonably* chosen? for to counterfeit the great (Seal and by such a Seal they were chosen) is Treason by the 25 of *Edw.* 3. 4. Suppose they had *engaged*, that is *fought against the King* under the Authority of both Houses legally called, sitting in their full number and remaining free, yet even then they had fought against their Soveraign upon no higher Authority than Subjects could give them (which was none at all to that end) for the two Houses (though consisting of all three Estates, Lords Spiritual, Temporal and Commons) are no more than Subjects, whatsoever this Author insinuates to the contrary in the following Lines. [*I have read*, says he, *that the Parliament of* England *hath several capacities; and among the rest these two.* 1. *That it represents the people as subjects, and so it can do nothing but manifest their Grievances and petition for relief:*] By the way I must tell him, that I have read in a Speech of King *James*'s to both Houses, *March* 21. 1609. these words, [*I would wish you (of the lower House especially) to be careful to avoid three things in the matter of Grievances.* 1. *That you do not meddle with the main points of Government. That is my Craft*, Tractent fabrilia fabri. *To meddle with*

with that were to lessen me; I must not be taught my office. 2. *Nor with such ancient Rights of mine as I have received from my Predecessors possessing them* more Majorum. — *For that were to judge me unworthy of that which my Predecessors had, and left me.* 3. *I pray you beware to exhibit for Grievance any thing that is established by a settled Law — for to be grieved with the Law, is to be grieved with the King, who is sworn to be the Patron and maintainer thereof: — In general beware that your Grievances savour not of particular mens thoughts, but of the general Griefs rising out of the minds of the people, and not out of the humour of the Propounder.*] If these Cautions had been carefully observed by the thing called the Long-Parliament; it had not been it self the greatest grievance the Subject ever felt.

[2. *I have read,* says he, *that by the Constitution it hath part in the Soveraignty, and so it hath part in the Legislative power and in the final Judgment.*] I question whether he hath read this thus expressed in any Book but his own: I rather think it a mistake, and that he had read somewhere that *the Parliament hath part in the Legislative power, and* [*so*] *it hath part in the Soveraignty*, there being a Treatise extant wherein the Parliament's part *in the Soveraignty*, is inferred from its part in the *Legislative power*, but none (that I know of) wherein *its part in the Legislative power* is argued from its part *in the Soveraignty*.

[*Now*,

[*Now,* says he, *when as a part of the Legislative power resides in the two Houses, as also a power to redress Grievances, and to call into Question all Ministers of State and Justice, and all Subjects of whatsoever degrees in case of Delinquency, it might be thought that a part of the Supreme power doth reside in them though they have not the Honorary Title.*]

To which I answer. 1. 'Tis denyed that either or both Houses have any power of themselves to redress the Grievances of the Kingdom, or to call into question any Delinquents. I have read (in his Majesties forementioned Declaration) that *the House of Commons hath never assumed, or in the least degree pretended to a power of Judicature, having no more Authority to administer an Oath (the only way to discover and find out Facts) to, than to cut off the Heads of any Subjects.* And in Judge *Jenkins* his *Lex Terræ*, p. 116. That a *Court must be either by the Kings Patent, or Statute-Law, or Common-Law, which is common and constant usage: The House of Commons hath neither Patent, Statute-Law, nor Common-Law, enabling them to be a Court or to give an Oath*, p. 27. *and* 140, 141. *or to examine a man*, p. 65. as also that *both the Houses can make no Court without the King*, p. 148. 122. *that the two Houses by the Law of this Land have no colour of power either to make or pardon Delinquents the King contradicting*, p. 24. and 119. and that *though it belong to the Lords to reform*

erroneous

erroneous Judgments given in other Courts (for that all the Judges of the Land, the Kings Council, and the twelve Masters of the Chancery assist there, by whose advice erroneous Judgments are redressed) yet when the writ of error is brought to reverse any Judgment, there is first a Petition to the King for the allowance thereof, p. 55. 106. I have read also (in the Hist. of Independ. *p.* 1. *p.* 61, 62.) *That the House of Peers is no Court of Judicature without the Kings special Authority granted to them, either by his Writ or his Commission, and therefore in the trial of the Earl of* Strafford, *and in all other trials upon Life and Death in the Lord's House, the King grants his Commission to a Lord high Steward to sit as Judge, and the rest of the Lords are but in the name of Jurors*; and says J. *Jenkins, p.* 103. *When the Lords had condemn'd to death by an Ordinance Sir* Simon de Beriford, *a free Commoner of* England, *they afterwards better considered the matter, and that they might be acquitted of the sentence, became suiters to the King, that what they had so done might not in future time be drawn into President, because that which they had done was against Law*; *and the Judge gives this reason against taking away mens lives by Ordinances, because an Ordinance binds not at all, (but* pro tempore, *as the two Houses then affirmed) and a mans life cannot be try'd by that which is not binding, and to continue for all times, for a life lost cannot be restored.*

From which premises I conclude, that neither one nor both Houses, though legally summoned

and elected, have power to redress publick Grievances or try Delinquents without the King's consent.

And as for that part of the Legislative power which is said to reside in them, and from whence their part in the Supremacy is thought fit to be concluded.] 1. The two Houses, even when full and free, have so constantly acknowledged themselves in Statutes and Acts of Parliament most loyal, faithful, and obedient subjects to the King their Soveraign Lord, that from this alone 'tis manifest enough they did not deem themselves to have any such part in the Legislative power as might entitle them to a part in the Soveraignty. 2. I have read in [the Rebels Plea examined] (*p.* 12.) these words, [*Neither is it true that the Legislative power is partly in them,* (*the two Houses*) *they are I grant to consent to the making new and abolishing old Laws, but that is no cogent proof of the partition of the Supreme and Legislative power:*] for which *p.* 14. he quotes these words of *Grotius*, *c.* 3. *de jure Belli sect.* 18. who says, *Multum falluntur qui existimant cum Reges acta quædam sua nolunt esse rata, nisi à Senatu probentur, partitionem fieri potestatis.* They are much deceived who think that the Supreme power is divided, if Kings will not account some of their Acts valid without the approbation of the Senate. I have read also in the Book called [*The Kings Supremacy asserted*] by Mr. *Sheringham*, *p.* 96, 97. *That the concurrence of one or both the other Estates with the Monarch in the making and promulgation*

mulgation of Laws is no good colour or pretence, much less a sufficient ground for such a coordination and mixture as is pressed. —— Although their assents be free and not depending upon the will of the Monarch, yet that makes them not coordinate with him in the Rights of Soveraignty. It's the common Assertion of Canonists, Civilians, Schoolmen, nor is it to my knowledge contradicted by any, that the Legislative power is delegable; that such a concurrence is no Argument of supremacy, or of such a mixture as some would infer out of it. Some call it therefore apparens mixtura, *because it seems to destroy a simple Form of Government, and to make a mixture in the power it self, but doth not, though otherwise they acknowledge it to be such a mixture as doth remit the simplicity thereof.* Grotius *affirms to this purpose* (de Imperio summ. potest. circa sacra, c. 8. N. 11.) Illam legislationem quæ alii quàm summæ potestati competit nihil imminuere de jure summæ potestatis. *He speaks this of Laws made by general Conventions, whose concurrence,* he saith, *doth not in the least manner diminish the Rights of Majesty. Such a mixture of the three Estates hath been in other Monarchies, which all men acknowledge to have been absolute in respect of power —— as in the* Persian, *which appears from* Dan. 6, 7, 8, 9. *and the* Roman *Empire —— And not only whole representative Bodies, but divers particular free Cities have the same priviledge, yet have not supreme Authority. —— As for the enacting Authority attributed in latter times to the Lords and Commons in the beginning of some*

Acts, he affirms, p. 101. *That 'tis only a power of assenting; for it hath been resolved by the Judges, that this clause* [*Be it enacted by the Kings most excellent Majesty, and the Authority of the Lords and Commons assembled in Parliament*] *is no more in substance and effect, than that which was used anciently* [*The King with the assent of the Lords and Commons establisheth:*] *the words* [*assenteth*] *and* [*enacteth*] *being equivalent in this case*; *and* p. 45. he tells us, *that though the two Houses have Authority granted them by the King to assent or dissent, yet the Legislative power belongs to the King alone by the Common Law: the Authority that animates (a Bill agreed upon by the two Houses) and makes it differ from a dead letter, being in the King, who is the life and soul of the Law:* —— *which was resolved also by divers Earls, and Barons, and by all the Justices in the time of* Edw. 3. *For one* Hardlow *and his Wife having a controversie with the King, and desiring to have it decided in Parliament, a reference being made to divers Earls and Barons, and to all the Justices, to consider of the business, it was resolved that the two Houses were not coordinate with the King in the legislative power, but that the King alone made Laws by the assent of the two Houses; that he had none equal or coordinate with him in his Realm, and that he could not be judged by the Lords and Commons.*

From all which it appears, 1. That that part which the two Houses have by Law in the Legislative power is not a sufficient *medium* to perswade us,

us, that they have a part in the ſupremacy: and 2. That they have no ſhare at all in any power which may properly be called Legiſlative, (I mean in that ſence in which the words [Legiſlative power] are now adays commonly taken, *viz.* for a power of making Laws. (For among the *Romans*, *Legem ferre* was no more than *Legem ad populum*, ---- *in concionem* ---- *quaſi in medium afferre & proponere*, and Legiſlation was no more than *Legis Rogatio à populo*, the propoſing the matter of a Law to the *Roman* Citizens, and asking their aſſent in order to its eſtabliſhment.) I conclude therefore, that the ſupremacy is wholly in the King, notwithſtanding this inſinuation to the contrary. For the proof whereof, if this Author ſtand in need of more Arguments, I refer him to *the Rebels Plea examined*, *p.* 11,12. to Dr. *Pierce's Impartial Enquiry into the Nature of ſin*, *Appendix*. *p.* 210, 211, *&c.* To Mr. *Sheringham's* [*Remonſtrance of the King's Right*, or, *the King's ſupremacy aſſerted.*] To Judge *Jenkins* his *Lex Terræ*, *p.* 7, 8, 9. Indeed this conſideration alone is ſufficient to evince it, that by the Oath adminiſtred to all that ſit in the lower Houſe the King is acknowledged the only Supreme Governor in all Cauſes, (*then in Parliament-Cauſes*, ſays J. *Jenkins*, *Lex Terræ*, *p.* 127.) over all Perſons, (*then over the two Houſes*, (*ibid.*) which Oath every Member of the Houſe of Commons is enjoyned by Law to take, or elſe he hath no Voice in that Houſe. (5 *Eliz. c.* 1. *Lex Terræ*, *p.* 67.) Therefore

the King is by Law the only supreme Governor, and consequently it may not be thought, that a part of the Supreme Power doth reside in the two Houses. Our Author goes on, [*And this part of the Supreme Power is capable indeed of doing wrong, but how it might be capable of Rebellion, is more difficult to conceive.*] 1. Here he [*confidently takes it for granted*] that the two Houses are part of the Supreme Power, whereas in the precedent words he spake more modestly, and told us only [*it might be thought*] that a part of the Supreme Power did reside in them, *not peremptorily inferring that it doth reside in them.* And indeed he could not rationally have so concluded, unless he had produced more cogent Arguments to make good that conclusion. 2. Whereas he acknowledges the two Houses capable of doing wrong, and tells us (only) that 'tis difficult to conceive how they may be guilty of Rebellion. 1. Notwithstanding this Apology the Presbyterians that acted in and by Authority derived from the two Houses *may have been guilty of Rebellion*, since the difficulty of conceiving how they might be thus guilty will not evince their innocence. 2. I demand of him, whether, 1. they are capable of doing such wrong (to the King) as the Law makes Treason and Rebellion; whether, 2. if they do such wrong it be not easie to conceive, that they are guilty of Rebellion and Treason. The Law of the Land (25 *Edw.* 3. *ch.* 2.) makes it treason *to levy war against our Lord the King in his Realm, or to be adherent to*

his

the Kings enemies in his Realm, giving to them aid or comfort in the Realm or elſewhere; and alſo *to counterfeit the Kings Great or Privy Seal, or Money. The reſolutions of all the Judges of* England *upon the ſaid Statute have been, that to ſeize upon the Kings Ports, Forts, Magazines for War, is high Treaſon,* Lex Terræ, p. 77. as likewiſe *to levy War either to alter the Religion, or any Law eſtabliſht,* p. 22. 40. or *to remove the Kings Counſellors,* p. 22. Yea, theſe things were acknowledged to be Treaſon, not only by Sir *Edw. Cooke* in his Inſtitutes (printed by an Order of both Houſes dated *May* 12. 1641.) but alſo by Mr. Solicitor *S. John*, and Mr. *Pym*, in their ſpeeches touching the Earl of *Strafford*. Where, as J. *Jenkins* quotes them, *Lex Terræ*, p. 187, 188. they likewiſe affirm it Treaſon *to uſurp the Royal power, to raiſe rumors, and give out words to alienate the peoples affections from the King, to ſubvert the Fundamental Laws, to impoſe unlawful Taxes, or new Oaths, to levy War within the Realm without authority from the King.* 'Tis confeſſed alſo by Sir *Edw. Cooke*, that *no priviledge of Parliament holds or is grantable for Treaſon, Felony or breach of the Peace,* (4. Inſtitut. 25.) If not to any one Member (ſays J. *Jenkins*, p. 15.) not to two, nor to ten, nor to the major part. Now I ſuppoſe this Author is not either ſo ignorant or ſo perverſe as to deny, that the two Houſes did levy War againſt the King; that they counterfeited the Great Seal; that they ſeized upon the Kings ports, Forts, Magazines

for War; that they uſurpt the Royal power; raiſed rumors, and gave out words to alienate the people from the King: impoſed a new Oath, unlawful Taxes, and levied War without yea againſt the Kings Authority. From which premiſes I diſcern not any difficulty in deducing this genuine (though ſad and diſmal) conſequence, that thoſe two Houſes and the presbyterian party which adhered to them, and gave them aid and comfort, were guilty of Diſobedience, Treaſon and Rebellion. *If the major part of a Parliament commit Treaſon, they muſt not be judges of it; for no man or body can be judge in his own cauſe, and as well as ten, or any number may commit Treaſon, the greater number may as well*, ſays J. *Jenkins*, Lex Terræ, p. 15, 16.

[*In this high and tender point it belongs not* (ſays our Author) *to me to determine.*]

The main reaſon of which ſcrupuloſity is moſt probably no other than this, that he's ſo much a Presbyterian, that either his blind and deluded underſtanding, or rather his diſloyal and rebellious heart will not ſuffer him to determine the Queſtion on the Kings ſide. For if this *Rector of Bramſhot* be not miſ-reported, he was heretofore a Preacher in a two-Houſes-Garriſon, and Chaplain to the Governor of that Garriſon, and at that time I preſume this was not look'd upon by him as a point too high and tender. But now *tempora mutantur* — and yet not ſo chang'd, it ſeems, but that this Author ſtill dares to inſinuate Apologies for the former damnable Presbyterian

rian practices of fighting againſt the King: witneſs theſe following words, *p.* 50. (60.)

And as touching the much debated point of reſiſting the higher Powers, without paſſing any judgment in the great caſe of England, *I ſhall only make rehearſal of the words of* Grotius, *a man of renown and known to be neither Anti-Monarchical nor Anti-Prelatical, which are found in his Book* de jure Belli & Pacis, *by himſelf dedicated to the* French *King,* [*Si Rex partem habeat ſummi imperii, partem alteram populus aut Senatus, Regi in partem non ſuam involanti vis juſta opponi poterit, quia eatenus Imperium non habet. Quod locum habere cenſeo etiamſi dictum ſit belli poteſtatem penes Regem fore. Id enim de bello externo intelligendum eſt; cum alioqui quiſquis Imperii ſummam partem habeat, non poſſit non jus habere eam partem tuendi,* L. 1. c. 4. ſect. 13.] (which Chapter, by the way, is proved to be dangerouſly Anti-Monarchical by the Author of the [*Obſervations on the original of Government*] *p.* 34, &c. but) Here I demand, 1. Whether this Author can reaſonably be imagined to produce theſe words of *Grotius* to any other end than to juſtifie the War of the Presbyterian Lords and Commons againſt the King. 2. Whether therefore his pretending not to paſs any judgment in the great caſe of *England* is not ſillily (and yet ſadly) hypocritical, eſpecially conſidering, 1 That in the precedent *p.* he takes it for granted, that the two Houſes had a part in the ſupreme power. 2. That the ſame Author, who infers their having ſuch a part from their having

having (as he fancies) a part in the Legislative power, quotes this very passage out of *Grotius*, to justifie the two Houses and himself, in fighting and encouraging others to fight against the King; which Author (yet) ingenuously promises that he will *offer his Head* (he meant, I suppose, his Neck) *to justice as a Rebel, when 'tis proved that the King was the highest power in the time of the divisions, and that he had power to make that War which he made. He here implicitly confesses*, says Dr. *Pierce*, (Impartial Enquiry, Postscript, p. 14, 15.) *the King was once the highest power, and implies he lost it by the divisions; but that he never could lose it, and that demonstrably he had it, I have made most evident in the Appendix of this Book, which concerns Mr.* B. *as much as Mr.* H. (*at least as far as I have proved the supremacy of the King*, § 78.) And that the King had power to make that War which he made (*in defence of* pars sua, *viz.* the ordering of the *Militia*, his Negative voice in Parliament, his right to the possession of all Castles, Forts, Ports, Magazines, within his Dominions, &c.) is as clearly the opinion of *Grotius* in this passage, as 'tis that the two Houses (*in partem non suam involantes*) had power to make that War which they made (to defend their own violation of the Kings Rights.) The truth is, those words of *Grotius* are no argument of the justness of the late War on either side, and therefore they are impertinently produced to such a purpose, till these *minors* are well and soundly proved: 1. That the

the two Houſes had legally a part in the ſupremacy, which *Grotius* himſelf denies can be concluded from that part which they had in Legiſlation. And 2. that the King did *involare in partem ſummi Imperii non ſuam*, invade any ſuch prerogative or part in the ſupremacy, (for of that only *Grotius* ſpeaks) as did by Law belong to the two Houſes. For though it could be proved, that the King did intrench upon ſome priviledge of theirs, yet if that priviledge did not belong to them, *quatenus having a ſhare in the Soveraignty*, *Grotius* his words (though they ſhould be granted of infallible truth) will not juſtifie their fighting againſt the King upon that account. But this ſly diſcourſer was perſwaded, it ſeems, that when he had rehearſed this hypothetical *major*, *Si Rex partem habeat ſummi Imperii, partem alteram populus aut Senatus, Regi, in partem non ſuam involanti, vis juſta opponi poterit:* Every Presbyterian that underſtood Latin, and had engaged againſt the King under the Authority of the two Houſes, would willingly take the *minor* for granted, (*Sed Senatus ille* (*qualis qualis*) *partem habuit ſummi Imperii, & in eam partem* (*non ſuam*) *involavit Rex*,) and thence very haſtily and joyfully conclude, *Ergò vis à Senatu iſto* (*vel potius Senatûs quiſquiliis & retrimentis*) *Regi oppoſita erat juſta*: even by the verdict of *Grotius*, that man of renown. At this Presbyterian rate of diſputing are Arguments hudled up in the Book called [*The Covenanters Plea againſt Abſolvers*,] the ſophiſtry of ſome parts of which Book

Book is scarce exceeded by *Knot's Volume against Chillingworth.* In it several hypothetical majors are to be met with, but the minors are either not mentioned, or else presumed to be true without any attempt made to prove them so. Now *Zachary Croston* tells us in his *Berith Anti-Baal*, p. 62. that [*Ifs*] *are no proofs or demonstrations ---- What good, duty, justice, morality, or religion may not be ruined, if a mans fancied* [*If*] *be reason enough against it? This way of disputing is apparently Jesuitical --- irrational, Machiavellian, barbarous.*

The Rector of *Bramshot* thus proceeds [*with reverence to soveraign Majesty, I crave leave to speak this word of truth and soberness.*] *Parturiunt Montes* --- one would think some very sage and important Oracle should forthwith drop from the Pen of this Reverend Dictator. [*In a knowing age, quoth he, flattery doth not really exalt or secure the Royal Prerogative.*] *Quid nascitur?* Such a Triobolary Truth as I believe there's scarce any *Presbyterian* so simple as to be ignorant of it. But there's something suggested in it that I am afraid will one day be found a notorious and fatal falsehood, *viz.* that this hath been [*a knowing Age*] as to those parties who have opposed and sought against the Royal interest; whereas I doubt 'tis far easier to prove, that in that respect it hath been either the *most ignorant*, (I mean of most grand, concerning Truths) or the *most maliciously wicked*, profligated and debauched Age that ever Protestant *England* knew.

[*Toe*

[*The Authority of Parliaments being depressed and undervalued is the more searched into and urged.*]

By [*Parliaments*] here 'tis evident enough he means the two Houses in contradistinction, yea opposition to the King: But says *Lex Terræ*, p. 80. *The Lords and Commons make no more a Parliament by the Law of the Land, than a Body without a Head makes a man; for a Parliament is a body composed of a King their head, Lords and Commons the members, all three together make one body, and that is the Parliament and none other. — The two Houses are not the Parliament but only parts thereof, and by the abuse and misunderstanding of this word* [*Parliament*] *they have miserably deceived the people.* And his late Majesty in answer to their Declaration of *May* 19. 1642. and to that part of it wherein they complain that *the Heads of the Malignant party have with much Art and Industry advised him to suffer divers unjust scandals and imputations upon the Parliament to be published in his Name*] has these words, *If we were guilty of that aspersion, we must not only be active in raising the scandal, but passive in the mischief begotten by that scandal: We being an essential part of the Parliament. And we hope the just defence of our self and our Authority, and the necessary Vindication of our innocence, and justice from the imputation laid on us by a major part then present of either or both Houses, shall no more be called a scandal upon the Parliament, than the opinion of such a part be reputed an Act of Parliament.*

liament. And we hope our good Subjects will not be long miſled by that common expreſſion in all the Declarations wherein they uſurp the word Parliament, *and apply it to countenance any reſolution or Vote ſome few have a mind to make, by calling it the reſolution of Parliament, which can never be without our conſent.* p. 5. *Neither can the vote of either or both Houſes make a greater alteration in the Laws of this Kingdom* —— *either by commanding or inhibiting any thing (beſides the known Rule of the Law) than our ſingle direction or mandate can do to which we do not aſcribe the Authority.* —— And now let this Author ſearch his Law-Books with the exacteſt diligence and skill he can, and then let him tell us by what Law the two Houſes abſtracted from the King have any Parliamentary Authority. Indeed his own following words do clearly enough imply that they have no ſuch Authority. For p. 51. (61.) he is ſo inconſiderately bold as to aſſert that [*Concerning the utmoſt bounds and limits of Royal Prerogative and Parliamentary power, the Law in deep wiſdom chooſes to keep ſilence, for it always ſuppoſes union, not diviſion between King and Parliament.*] Whence all that I ſhall conclude is, that the power of a Parliament truly ſo called, *viz.* King, Lords Spiritual, Temporal, and Commons is not limited by Law; and thence I gather either that ſome Acts of Parliament are no Laws; or that that part of ſome Acts wherein 'tis declared that any following ſtatutes contrariant to ſuch and ſuch preceding ſtatutes ſhall

be

be utterly void, is vain and ridiculous. But 2. That the two Houses when they usurped the power of a Parliament (as well as the name) and acted in opposition to the King, had no Law on their side to justifie their actings: For if the Law always supposes union between King and Parliament, it speaks nothing of the Rights and Priviledges of the two Houses in case of their division from and opposition to the King. And 3. That the Kings power and prerogative is absolute, and notwithstanding all Law of this Nation infinite, for if the Law be silent, and that in deep wisdom too, as to the utmost bounds of the Royal Prerogative, it hath very wisely left it unbounded: which latter conclusions (and the first also) are so prejudicial to the Presbyterian Interest and Party, that I doubt they will conclude him either *the veryest Fool* (if indeed he knew not that the Kings Prerogative was bounded by Law) or *the most Malignant Flatterer* that this knowing Age hath brought forth.

His next Argument to evince Presbyterian Loyalty is, that [*The subversion of the Fundamental Government of this Kingdom could never be effected till those Members of Parliament that were Presbyterian, were many of them imprisoned, others forcibly secluded by the violence of the Army, and the rest thereupon withdrew from the House of Commons.*] An assertion so notoriously false, that it puts me in mind of the proverb in the late War, that — some men *would not swear*

ſwear but they would lye baſely. The truth is, the ſubverſion of the Fundamental Government of this Kingdom both in Church and State was the great work of the Long-Parliament, which they effected in the Church, by overthrowing the Hierarchy and that Prelacy in which the Holy Church of *England* was founded (*Stat. of Carliſle*, 25 *Edw.* 1. recited 25 *Edw.* 3.) in the State by paſſing and preſſing upon the King that Bill againſt the Biſhops ſitting and voting in Parliament (who were in all Parliaments either perſonally or by Proxy ſince we had any;) who were once of the States of Parliament, and in the Act of Parliament 8 *Eliz.* c. 1. acknowledged *one of the greateſt States of this Realm:* all whoſe Liberties and Priviledges, (and conſequently that of ſitting in Parliament, *to which they ought to be ſummoned ex debito Juſtitiæ, Cookes Inſtitut.* 4. c. 9.) are confirmed to them by *Magna Charta*, which was it ſelf ratified by 32 Acts of Parliament, and that inviolably by the 42 of *Edw.* 3. enacting that *if any Statute be made to the contrary it ſhall be holden for none* (and conſequently the Act of Parliament ſo called, againſt that Priviledge of the Biſhops, was *ipſo facto* null and void) by robbing the King of his Negative voice, of his power in the Militia, by making Ordinances without him, yea againſt him, and ſo practically denying what they verbally ſwore, that he was the only ſupreme Governour in all Cauſes and over all Perſons: By their electing new members warranted only by a counterfeit Seal: By their taking

king upon them to create new Judges, Juſtices, and other Officers without the Kings conſent. — *For Laws and Liberties,* ſays J. Jenkins, p. 146. *have not the prevailing party in the two Houſes deſtroyed above an hundred Acts of Parliament, and in effect* Magna Charta, *and* Charta de Foreſta, *which are the Common Laws of the Land?* And p. 135. *The Writ of Summons to this Parliament is the Baſis and Foundation of the Parliament; if the Foundation be deſtroyed, the Parliament falls. The Aſſembly of Parliament is for three purpoſes:* [Rex eſt habiturus colloquium & tractatum cum Prælatis, Magnatibus & Proceribus ſuper arduis negotiis concernentibus, 1. Nos. 2. Defenſionem Regni noſtri. 3. Defenſionem Eccleſiæ Anglicanæ.] *The King,* ſays the Writ, *intends to confer and treat with the Prelates, Earls, Barons, about the arduous affairs relating to* 1. *our Royal ſelf,* 2. *the defence of our Realm,* 3. *the defence of the Church of* England. *This Parliament,* ſays the Judge, *hath overthrown this Foundation in all three parts.* 1. Nos, *Our Royal ſelf; the King they have chaſed away, and impriſoned (* at Holmbey *) they have voted no Prelates, and that a number of other Lords (* about forty *in the City) muſt not come to the Houſe, and* about *forty more are out of Town; the conference and treaty is made void thereby; for the King cannot conſult and treat there with men removed from thence.* 2. *The defence of our Realm,*] *that is gone, they have made it* [*their*] *Kingdom, not his; for they have uſurp'd all his Soveraignty.*

3. *The defence of the Church of* England,] *that is gone. By* the Church of England *must be understood necessarily that Church that at the* Teste *of the Writ was* Ecclesia Anglicana; *they have destroyed that too. So now these men would be called a Parliament, having quashed and made nothing of the Writ whereby they were summoned and assembled. If the Writ be made void, the Process must be void also. The House must needs fall where the Foundation is overthrown*: thus he. And all this was done before those Members of Parliament that were Presbyterian were many of them imprisoned, and others forcibly secluded by the violence of the Army: So that 'tis very wonderful how this *Rector of Bramshot* could be either so ignorant or so impudent as to utter such an assertion, especially since in his own following words (which it seems he fancied to be a proof of its Truth) a very considerable Argument is suggested to evince it an egregious Falshood. For, quoth he,

[*They had voted the Kings Concessions a ground sufficient for the Houses to proceed on to settle the Nation, and were willing to cast whatsoever they contended for upon a legal security.*]

Now in that very Treaty at the Isle of *Wight* the Presbyterian party wrested such Concessions from the King, as did (*in their own nature*) subvert the Fundamental Government of this Kingdom, as is evident from the speech of Mr. *Prynne* himself, concerning those Concessions, (3. *Edit.* p. 38.) wherein he confesses, that *the Kings of* England

England *have* [*always*] *held two ſwords in their hands — the ſword of Mars in time of War — the ſword of Juſtice in time of Peace.* — And p. 37. he tells us, *that in thoſe Conceſſions the King had wholly ſtript himſelf, his Heirs and Succeſſors for ever, of all that power and intereſt which his Predeceſſors* [*always*] *enjoyed in the* Militia, *Forces, Forts, Navy,* (*Magazines,* p. 36.) *not only of* England, *but* Ireland, Wales, Jerſey, Guernſey *and* Barwick *too, ſo as he and they can neither raiſe nor arm one man, nor introduce any foreign Forces into any of them, by vertue of any Commiſſion, Deputation, or Authority, without conſent of both Houſes of Parliament; and that he had veſted the ſole power and diſpoſition of the Militia, Forts and Navy, of all theſe, in both Houſes, in ſuch ample manner, that they ſhould never part with it to any King of* England, *unleſs they pleaſed themſelves.* — *A ſecurity,* ſays Mr. Pryn, *ſo grand and firm, that* [none of] our Anceſtors [ever] demanded, *or enjoyed the like* — nor any other Kingdom whatſoever, ſince the Creation, (*for ought that I can find*) *and ſuch a ſelf-denying condeſcenſion in the King to his people in this particular as no Age can Precedent.* Thus *the ſword of Mars* (which themſelves confeſs the former Kings of *England always* held) was inſolently wreſted out of the late Kings hands, and conſequently the Fundamental Government of the Nation ſubverted in this particular. *Beſides, ſome Parliaments,* ſays he, p. 40. *in former times have had the nomination of the Lord Chancellor, ſome of the Lord Treaſu-*

rer, ſome of the great Juſticiary, or ſome few Judges of England only; *but never any Parliament of* England *claim'd or enjoy'd the nomination and appointment of any the great Officers, Barons, Judges or Treaſurers places* in Ireland; *nor yet of the Lord Warden of the Cinque-Ports, Chancellors of the Exchequer, and Dutchy, Secretaries of State, Maſter of the Rolls, or Barons of the Exchequer of* England, *yet all theſe the King for peace-ſake hath parted with to us*: And p. 41. *we have the diſpoſal (* he might have added, Horreſco referens *) of all theſe Officers in* England *and* Ireland, *both Military and Civil; of his ſword of War and Peace, his Juſtice, his Conſcience, his Purſe, his Treaſury, his Papers, his publick Records, his Cabinet, his Great Seal, more than ever we at firſt expected or deſired.* Thus horridly was *the ſword of Juſtice* alſo wreſted out of his Majeſties hands, and conſequently the Fundamental Government of the Nation ſubverted in that particular likewiſe. Another Conceſſion was, that no Peer, who ſhould be *(* after that Treaty *)* made by the King, his Heirs and Succeſſors, ſhould ſit or vote in the Parliament of *England*, without conſent of both Houſes of Parliament, *which*, ſays Mr. Pryn, p. 43. *gives ſuch an extraordinary new power to the Houſe of Commons as they never formerly enjoyed nor pretended to. By which proviſion*, p. 44. *the Commons are made not only in ſome ſence the Judges of Peers themſelves, (which they could not try or judge before, by the expreſs letter of* Magna Charta, cap. 29. *and the*

Common

Common Law) but even their very Creators too. And (if the Houſe of Commons might juſtly be term'd any part of the Fundamental conſtitution of our Nation) what was this but to ſubvert the Fundamental Government? By other Conceſſions the Houſes were enabled, *p.* 45. *to make an Act of Parliament (for raiſing of moneys and ordering the Militia) though the King denied his Royal Aſſent, which power was never challenged by, nor granted to both Houſes in any Kings reign before, and takes away the Kings Negative voice as to thoſe particulars.* To paſs by other inſtances (for I am quite weary of raking in ſuch a ſtinking Dunghil) theſe are enough to manifeſt, what kind of creatures Presbyterians were in point of loyalty, when they had power in their hands to be (*impunè*) diſloyal; and how willing to ſubvert the Fundamental Government of this Kingdom, ſince by vertue of theſe propoſitions, which they had the imperious confidence to tender to his ſacred Majeſty in that deplorable condition to which they had reduced him; they denuded him of his Royal power, and veſted themſelves with all the conſiderable parts of Soveraignty: and when they had thus ſubverted the Fundamental Conſtitution of the Engliſh Monarchy, and had paſs'd that Vote (which this Author mentions) touching the Kings Conceſſions, and were thereupon deprived by the Army of that power of impoſing on his Majeſty and the Kingdom, which they had ſo Tyrannically abuſed; theſe ſecluded and impriſoned Members wrote a

Vindication of themselves from the Aspersions cast upon them by the Army; in one passage of which Vindication (*p.* 8, 9.) they give us reason enough to suspect, that if their own prosperity had continued, they would yet more unworthily have insulted over his Majesty, and have taken such a cruel advantage of those great infelicities (into which themselves had cast him) as to tender and extort from him some more diminutions (if possible) of that *little power, and no greatness* which the former had left him; *for*, say they, *by this Vote* (viz. *that the Kings Concessions were a ground sufficient for the House to proceed upon to settle the Nation*) *the House did not determine, as we conceive, the having no farther Treaty with his Majesty, before a concluding and declaring of peace; nor were the Houses so bound up thereby, that they could not propose any thing farther, wherein the Kings Answers were defective, or from making any new Propositions for the better healing our breaches, or more safe binding up a just and righteous peace.*] It seems then those Lords and Commons had some more such signal testimonies in pickle of their Presbyterian loyalty, some more demonstrations, that when they took and imposed the Covenant, they had no thoughts and intentions to diminish his Majesties just power and greatness. It seems they had some clearer explications in their Budget of their meaning in those words in the Preface to the Covenant. [*Having before our eyes the honour and happiness of the Kings Majesties person and his posterity*:] which words

words interpreted by their actions, must signifie, that they had it before their eyes, *only as a mark to shoot at*. But God deliver us for the time to come from the Presbyterian reserves of such a *disloyal and corrupt majority*; wherein they abundantly manifested how tractable Scholars they were to Scotch Teachers, and how able and willing to imitate, yea, transcend that ungodly pattern which they had set them, who, when the King had before granted them more than was fit for such persons to receive, had the insolent confidence to ask moreover such things as 'twas not fit for the King to give. And thus the English Presbyterians by enlarging their desires as Hell, fill'd up the measure of that Scotch iniquity, which he that runs may read in his late Majesties *large Declaration of the Tumults in* Scotland, printed *Ann.* 1638.

Our Author proceeds thus;

[*In those times the Presbyterian Ministers of* London, *in their publick Vindication thus declare themselves:* [*We profess before God, Angels and Men, that we verily believe, that that which is so much feared to be now in agitation, the taking away the life of the King in this present way of Trial, is not only not agreeable to the word of God, the principles of the Protestant Religion, (never yet stain'd with the least drop of the blood of a King) or the Fundamental Constitution and Government of this Kingdom, but contrary to them, as also to the Oath of Allegiance, the Protestation of* May 5. 1641. *and the Solemn League and Covenant; from*

all which, or any of which Engagements we know not any Power on Earth able to abſolve us or others.] To which I anſwer:

1. Though the Presbyterian Miniſters of *London* were granted not guilty *of* [*the death*] *of the King*, yet they might be guilty of [*diſobedience and rebellion*] againſt him, which was the objection, *p.* 48. 58. to which objection therefore this Apology is impertinent. 2. Nor is the Apology at all ſatisfactory as to the taking away of the Kings life *in* [*ſome other way of Trial*] it being deſigned only *againſt that preſent way of Trial*; for 'tis only with that limiting ſpecification that they vindicate themſelves; for they ſay, that [*the taking away the Kings life in this preſent way of Trial is not agreeable to the word of God, &c.*] Whence all that I can conclude in reaſon is, that they did not imagine it agreeable to the word of God, or the principles of the Proteſtant Religion, or the Fundamental Conſtitution of this Kingdom, or the Oath of Allegiance, Proteſtation, Covenant, to take away his life in that way of Trial, *viz.* by that High Court of Juſtice ſet up by the Independent party; but notwithſtanding this they might deem it conſiſtent with the word of God and the principles of the Proteſtant Religion, &c. to take away his life in a way of Trial appointed and modelled by the corrupt majority of the two Houſes, the Presbyterian Lords and Commons: And if the Author of *Clerico-Claſſicum* deceive us not, (*p.* 35. of his Anſwer to the *London*-Miniſters letter to the

the General and Council of War, *Jan.* 18. 1648.) Mr. *Pryn* allows of a capital proceeding against Emperors, Kings and Princes, in his Appendix to the fourth part of his Soveraign power of Parliaments, *p.* 190. *ad* 194. If I am not deceived also, a man called Mr. *Christopher Love*, who I think deem'd himself a Minister of *Jesus* Christ, I am sure he was a Presbyterian Minister of *London*, did in a thing called a Sermon at *Uxbridge* Treaty, justifie, yea, urge the taking away of the Kings life in as bad a way of Tryal; for in that Sermon having spoken of the blood-guiltiness of the King, yea intimated unnatural-horrible-blood-guiltiness in him, and thereby made him the troubler of *England*, as *Achan* was of *Israel*, he hath these words, *p.* 32. *'Twas the Lord that troubled* Achan *because he troubled* Israel; *Oh that in this, our State-Physicians would resemble God, to cut off those from the Land who have distempered it! melius est ut pereat unus quàm unitas, Immedicabile vulnus Ense recidendum est.* ——but yet more plain *p.* 37. *men who lye under the guilt of much innocent blood are not meet persons to be at peace with, till all the guilt of blood be expiated and avenged, either by the sword of the Law, or by the Law of the sword. Mr. Love*, says that Author, *will not say that the King was not guilty of much innocent blood, lest he should contradict himself; neither will he say that blood-guiltiness can be expiated but by blood, lest he should contradict the Scriptures; neither can he say but the King was cut*

off

off either by the sword of the Law or by the Law of the sword — Whence I conclude that according to those Principles of Mr. *Love*, the King's being put to death in that way of Tryal was neither contrary to the word of God, nor the Principles of the Protestant Religion, &c. but a work fit and expedient to be done: and 'twill be well for English Presbyterians, if when the secrets of all hearts shall be laid open, it be not revealed to the world that the main reason why they deprecated the putting the King to death in that way of Tryal, was because he was not tryed and condemned by Presbyterians, nor for their advantage; but by those men who hated Presbytery and would not suffer it to domineer any longer. For these very men could notwithstanding both the word of God and the principles of the English Protestant Religion, notwithstanding the protestation and Solemn League and Covenant, yea notwithstanding the Fundamental Constitution of this Kingdom and the Oath of Allegiance, I say maugre all these obligations to the contrary (if at least, one of them be such an obligation) these very men could join with the Presbyterian Lords and Commons in making War against the King, and send an Army to shed his bloud in the high places of the Field; and therefore if Presbyterians be Protestants, and their Religion the Protestant Religion, 'twas not their Loyalty but the divine goodness and providence wonderfully interposing for the Kings safety, that in so many battels kept the Protestant Religion from being

stained

ſtained with the bloud of a King; eſpecially as to *Edge-Hill*-fight, if that be true which is affirmed in *Fabian Philips* his *Veritas inconcuſſa*, *p.* 79. that *Blague, a villain in the Kings Army, had a great penſion allowed him that he might give notice in what part of the Field the King ſtood, that they might the better know how to ſhoot at him:* who accordingly gave notice of it, and if God had not had a greater care of his Anointed than of their Rebellious pretences, that Bullet from the Earl of *Eſſex* his Canon which graz'd at the King's Heels as he was Kneeling at his prayers on the ſide of a bank had taken away his life; and the Presbyterian Religion, (ſuch as it is) had been ſtained with the bloud of a King. *And though the Presbyterians* (as the Apology for Biſhops ſitting and voting in Parliament tells us, *p.* 69.) *would excuſe themſelves that they never intended the Kings deſtruction, yet that is a frivolous and fooliſh excuſe: For as Sir* Walter Rawleigh *ſays truly, Our Law doth conſtrue all levying War without the Kings Commiſſion, and all force raiſed, to be intended for the death and deſtruction of the King, not attending the ſequel, and ſo 'tis judged upon good reaſon; for every unlawful and ill action is ſuppoſed to be accompanied with an ill intent. The Lord* Cook (as the Apologizer goes on, *p.* 70. ſpeaking fully of all kinds and degrees of Treaſon, 3 Inſtitut. *p.* 12. ſaith,) *Preparation by ſome overt act to depoſe the King, or take the King by force and ſtrong hand, and to impriſon him until he hath yielded to certain demands, is a ſufficient*

overt

overt Act to prove the compaſſing and imagination of the death of the King: For this upon the matter is to make the King a Subject, and to deſpoil him of his Kingly office of Royal Government, and ſo it was reſolved by all the Judges of England, Hill. 1 Jac. Regis, *in the caſe of the Lord* Cobham, *Lord* Grey, *and* Watſon *and* Clark *Seminary Prieſts; and ſo it had been reſolved by the Juſtices,* Hill. 43 Eliz. *in the caſe of the Earls of* Eſſex *and* Southampton, *who intended to go to the Court where the Queen was, and to have taken her into their power, and to have removed divers of her Council; and for that end did aſſemble a multitude of people, which being raiſed to the end aforeſaid, was a ſufficient overt Act for compaſſing the death of the Queen. —— The Presbyterians,* ſays he, *did offend in this kind notoriouſly, and therefore committed Treaſon manifeſtly; for they impriſoned the King in divers places, and at length in a remote place in the Iſle of* Wight —— *and all this done by them who were for the moſt part Presbyterians, out of their deſign to compel the King to yield to their projects, to overthrow the Biſhops and to take their Lands and their revenues.* —— From this we may judge how agreeable Presbyterian actions were to the Conſtitution and Law of this Kingdom; and how manifeſt it is that *they muſt in Law be reckoned King-killers* as well as the Army; and if the Law of the Nation damn them to ſuch a guilt and puniſhment on earth, there is no Goſpel that I know of will ſave them from Hell without a repentance proportionable

portionable to their Crimes, which (for ought I ſee) they are hitherto ſo far from thinking a duty, that they rather go about to juſtifie their former actings by returning again (as far as they dare) to the ſame follies that uſhered in their former war and at firſt embrued the Nation in bloud. Nor do I believe that they who took away the Kings life in that way of Trial acted upon any more treaſonable and rebellious Principles, than are owned and taught *by ſome Presbyterian writers of the firſt magnitude, both French, Scotch and Engliſh.* The truth whereof I doubt will be very evident to him that can get and will peruſe theſe Presbyterian Scripts. *Buchanan's de jure regni apud Scotos. Knox's Appellation. —— Vindiciæ contra Tyrannos (by Junius Brutus, ſuppoſed to be either Beza or Hottoman.) David Pareus his Commentary on Rom.* 13. *(burnt at London and Oxford, in King James his reign for its ſeditious Maxims. Goodman* (an intimate Friend as 'tis ſaid of *John Knox's*) *his book of the ſame nature and tendency. Rutherford's Lex Rex.* I find in Biſhop *Bancroft's* Dangerous Poſitions, B. 1. Ch. 2. (ſpeaking of *Calvin's* reforming at *Geneva*) theſe words: *Since which time, as I ſuppoſe it hath been a principle with ſome of the chief Miniſters of* Geneva *(but contrary to the Judgment of all other reformed Churches (for ought I know) which have not addicted themſelves to follow* Geneva) *that if Kings and Princes refuſe to reform Religion, the inferiour Magiſtrates or people by direction of the Miniſtry might*

might lawfully, and ought if need required, even by force and Arms to reform it themselves. And Ch. 4. This Position is quoted out of *Knox*, *that the punishment of such crimes as touch the Majesty of God doth not appertain to Kings and chief Rulers only, but also to the whole body of the people, and to every member of the same as occasion, vocation, and ability shall serve to revenge the injury done against God. That the people are bound by Oath to God to revenge to the utmost of their power the injury done against his Majesty* —*That if Princes be Tyrants against God and his Truth, their Subjects are freed from their Oath of obedience.* And out of *Bucanan* these, *That the people may arraign the Prince; bestow the Crown at their pleasure* — *that the Ministery may excommunicate him* — *that an excommunicate person is not worthy to enjoy any life on earth* — *that it were good that rewards were appointed by the people for such as should kill Tyrants* —— And Ch. 5. To this objection [*God places Tyrants sometimes for the punishment of his people*] this answer (given by the Reverend *Bucanan*) *so doth he private men sometimes to Kill them. And this new Divinity*, says the Bishop, *of dealing thus with Kings and Princes, is not held only by* Knox *and* Bucanan, *but generally for ought I can learn by most of the Consisterians of chief name beyond the Seas, who being of the* Geneva *humour, do endeavour by most unjust and disloyal means to subject to their forged Presbyteries the Scepters and Swords of Kings and Princes, as* Calvin, Beza, Hottoman, Ursin

Ursin (*as he cometh out from* Newstadt) vindiciæ contra Tyrannos. Eusebius, Philadelphus, &c. These also B. 2. Ch. 1. I find out of *Goodman*. *Evil Princes ought by the Law of God to be deposed; and inferiour Magistrates ought chiefly to do it* — *It is lawful to kill wicked Kings and Tyrants* — *when Magistrates cease to do their duties, (in thus deposing or killing Princes) the people are as it were without officers, and then God gives the sword into their hands, and he himself is become immediately their Head, for to the multitude a portion of the Sword of Justice is committed.* And out of him and a Book of Obedience, these: *If neither the inferiour Magistrates nor the greatest part of the people will do their Offices (in punishing, deposing, or killing of Princes) then the Minister must excommunicate such a King; any Minister may do it against the greatest Prince. God will send to the rest of the people who are willing to do their duty but not able, some* Moses *or* Othoniel. *——by the word of God a private man having some special inward motion may kill a Tyrant —— Or otherwise a private man may do so if he be commanded or permitted by the Commonwealth.* Now if some inferiour Magistrate, a handful of the people, yea one man may kill a Tyrant, an evil Prince, one that refuses to reform Religion, this implyes that the same person or persons may be a Judge or Judges, whether such or such a King be a Tyrant, an evil Prince, a refuser to reform, and consequently one that deserves death or no.

upon

Upon such wicked principles as these (dictated and taught by Presbyterian Oracles) in conjunction with this *minor*, that the late King was a person so criminal as to deserve death, which they that ordered his Trial took upon them to be Judges of, as they might well by these now mentioned principles, horrid Regicide was pathetically recommended (to his Auditors at *Uxbridge*-Treaty) by Mr. *Christopher Love*, a Presbyterian Minister of *London*; and long after that perpetrated by Order of a part of the people, some Commons and the High Court of Justice, who adjudged the King to be thus criminous; and apologiz'd for by *John Price*, Citizen of *London*, in his *Clerico-Classicum*, as an Act agreeable enough to the declared judgment of many Protestant (*he means Presbyterian*) Divines, in testimony whereof he quotes several passages *out of Presbyterian Authors*, p. 32. to 35. which Pamphlet, if the Title-page deceive us not, may serve as a brief answer to that Vindication of the *London* Ministers here spoken of. And indeed 'tis a discourse so abounding with strong and rational Arguments *ad hominem*, that I doubt 'tis beyond the skill of a Presbyterian to give a solid and satisfactory reply to it. From all which it follows, that either the Presbyterian Ministers of *London* must damn the now mentioned Principles and Tenents of those their Presbyterian Ancestors, and their own opinions also at the *Uxbridge*-Treaty, if they were the same with Mr. *Love*'s, one of their Tribe, or else they must justifie this inference,

inference, *That the taking away the life of the King in that (then) present way of Trial, was rather a duty than a crime*: Which though it be a wretched and Traiterous conclusion, yet is very regularly deducible from those principles.

And I appeal to any intelligent and ingenuous persons, and desire them to tell me, whether the murderers of the late King did infer that bloudy Corollary from any more treasonable and rebellious Theorems and Consectaries, than these which I have now produced; and whether Independents did not in justifying that horrid Fact, write exactly after those Copies, which Presbyterians both ancient and modern had set them. And hence I think I may reasonably affirm, that those principles of the Protestant Religion, which are contrary to King-killing, are no otherwise owned by such Presbyterians, as I have now spoken of, than as most Presbyterians say, that Papists own some Articles of our Faith, *viz.* damnably, because they hold together with them other principles which consequentially overthrow those Articles. And therefore 'twas but a vanity in the *London* Ministers to vindicate themselves, by speaking of those principles as opposite to that way of Trial: a greater folly was it to produce the solemn League and Covenant, which in the third Article talks so loosely and crudely of defending the Kings person and Authority, that Presbyterians might without offering any violence to the words, plunder him of all his Authority; and both they and the Independents take

away his life, notwithstanding that Article, whensoever they should think fit to determine, that the true Religion and Libertie of the Kingdoms could not be defended and preserved, unless the Kings person and Authority were destroyed: But in the fourth Article there's as clear and smooth a way opened to the commission of that heinous sin, as the most forward Actors in it needed to desire; for there the Covenanters are bound with all faithfulness to endeavour the discovery of all such as have been or shall be Incendiaries, Malignants, evil Instruments, that they may be brought to publick Trial, and receive condign punishment, not only as the degree of their offences required or deserved, but also *as the Supreme Judicatories* (whether *de facto* or *de jure*, we are not certified) *of both Kingdoms respectively, or others having power from them for that effect should judge convenient*: So that since the men who ordered the Trial of the King were at that time *de facto* the supreme Judicatory of *England*; and since they look'd upon him as an Incendiary and evil Instrument, and therefore to be brought to publick Trial, and the men impowred by them judged it to be (at least) convenient to take away his life in that way of Trial; their murdering of Him in that way was not contrary, but agreeable enough to the Solemn League and Covenant: Yea, to imagine that by that League *Scotland* was bound to rescue the Kings person from the Parliament of *England*, because of their Voting, that no farther application or Addresses should

ſhould be made to his Majeſty, under pain of High Treaſon, is called a ſlandering of the Covenant in that humble *Edenburgh* Remonſtrance, *p.* 45. Nor is either the Proteſtation of *May* 5. 1641. or the Oath of Allegiance, or the word of God, more wiſely or pertinently urged by thoſe *London* Miniſters againſt thoſe murderers, ſince all thoſe obligations do as much forbid and condemn *fighting againſt the King, and diſhonouring, and dethroning him*, which Presbyterians were abundantly guilty of, as they do *putting him to death*, which the Independents did, ('tis true) but after the Presbyterians had firſt ſtript him of his honour, and Royal State, and ſo *politically killed him.*

All which conſidered, 'tis very admirable to me, that thoſe Presbyterian Miniſters of *London* (eſpecially Mr. *Love*) could ſo confidently talk thus in vindication of their own Innocency, and in oppoſition to thoſe Independent malefactors, as alſo with what face they could (as our Author tells us they did, *p.* 52–62.) *warn and exhort men to pray for the King, that God would reſtrain the violence of men, that they might not dare to draw upon themſelves and the Kingdom the blood of their Soveraign.*] To uſe his own words, [*Let prudent men weigh things in the balance of reaſon,*] and tell us whether it were not a piece of practical Non-ſence and contradictious hypocriſie, for thoſe Prieſts who had imployed themſelves ſo many years together in curſing thoſe that fought not againſt the King, and bleſſing thoſe that did,

to warn and exhort men (at last) to pray that God would restrain the violence of men, and not suffer them to draw upon themselves and the Kingdom the bloud of their Soveraign. If they had exhorted men to put up such a petition in the time of the Wars, would they not thereby have exposed themselves to the scorn and derision of their Auditors? Yea, would not their own Lords and Commons have treated them as Incendiaries, Malignants, evil Instruments; or were they so sottish as to imagine that there's so great difference between a Camp and a Scaffold, between an Army of Rebels, and a single Executioner, that 'twas a duty to pray to God to protect the King from the danger of the one, but no duty to pray for his safeguard from the assaults of the other? Or did they indeed believe if the King had been mortally wounded in the Field (at *Edgehill*, *Newbery*, or *Naseby*, by one or more of the Presbyterian Souldiers) that this had not been *violence*, or that the Presbyterian Lords and Commons had not thereby *drawn upon themselves and the Kingdom the bloud of their Soveraign?* I seriously profess, that the more narrowly I search into these things, the more reason I have to fear (what indeed this very Vindication suggests) that had the Kings life been taken away, *either by Presbyterian Armies in the Field (the law of the Sword) or by order of Presbyterian Judges on a Scaffold (the Sword of their Law) for the advancement of the Presbyterian Interest, they would easily have believed such a manner of death, or*

way

way of Trial agreeable enough to, and consistent with all the obligations here spoken of, even the Covenant it self: as to which, says *Price* in his *Clerico-Classicum*, p. 27, 28. *We were bound to preserve and defend the Kings person, when we first took this Covenant, and at that time you* (Presbyterian Ministers of *London*) *know very well you stirred up the people to fight against* his Army, *though* his Person *was the leader thereof; which presumes either,* 1. *That you perswaded the people against the dictates of your own Consciences; or,* 2. *That you conceived, that though his Person should be smitten into the chambers of Death, by those that did fight against his Army, yet they did not break the Covenant. If so, then there is a case wherein the King's Person may be cut off without breach of Covenant.*] Thus he, and appositely enough, and therefore I say again, *Let prudent men weigh things in the balance of Reason.*

Our Author goes on and asks, *Is there any thing in the nature of Prelacy that frames the mind to obedience and loyalty? or is there any thing in the nature of Presbytery that enclines to rebellion and disobedience---?* A. If he means by the nature of Prelacy the principles of Prelatical Protestants, and by the nature of Presbytery the principles of Presbyterians, I maintain the affirmative in both Questions, and suppose I have already abundantly evinc'd it, as to Presbyterians both Scotch and English; and as for Prelatical Protestants, if this Author or any body else can produce any such enormous and seditious principles

out of their Writings, as I have here quoted out of Presbyterian Authors, let thoſe writings, by my conſent, and together with them Mr. *Pryn's Soveraign Power of Parliaments*, (by which word [*Parliaments*] he means the two Houſes, without and againſt the King) undergo the ſame Fate with *David Pareus* his Commentary, and the Presbyterian League and Covenant; and if any of their practiſes have been ſuitable, let thoſe mens perſons alſo have the odious character of Rebellion and Diſobedience affixt unto them. But that any ſuch Prelatical Proteſtant can be produced, is more than I know or have any reaſon to believe. Certain I am, that Engliſh Proteſtant Prelatiſts profeſs their aſſent to, and practically own thoſe principles mentioned, *p.* 24, 25. Which Principles do in their own nature, and where they are cordially embraced, frame the minds of Engliſh Subjects to obedience and loyalty; and therefore let this Author prove, if he can, that *ſince a Proteſtant Prelacy was erected among us*, our Kings have had any ſuch tedious conflicts with Prelates, as he ſays they had in ancient times, and for a ſeries of many Ages. As for *the Popes Prelates*, they are ſo near of kin to *Presbyterians*, that 'tis no great wonder if they create trouble to Princes.

If, ſays he, *Presbytery and Rebellion be connatural, how comes it to paſs that thoſe States or Kingdoms where it hath been eſtabliſht or tolerated, have for any time been free from broils and commotions?*] One would think there were a ſufficient anſwer

answer comprehended in the words of the Question. For those Presbyterians are rebellious with a witness, that will embroil even those States and Kingdoms where their Form of Worship and Polity is either establisht or tolerated; and yet *the French Protestants* are abused by a late Reflecter on the Oaths of Supremacy and Allegiance, if notwithstanding this they are not too prone to Rebellion, *and that on account of their Principles. What an exception,* says he (p. 42. of his Reflexions) *terrible to Princes, the French Calvinistical Church hath made in their Confession of Faith, speaking of obedience due to the Supreme Magistrate, appears at least every Sunday in all their hands in Print, where they acknowledge such Obedience due to them, except the Law of God and Religion be interessed (on condition that Gods Soveraignty remain undiminish'd;) which clause,* says he, *what it means, their so many and so long continued Rebellions do expound.*] What turbulent things Scotch and English Presbyterians have been, those very practises of theirs, which these sheets have mentioned (to which many more might be added) are a competent Testimony. But this *Quare* shall not scape so, let's view it again. [*If Presbytery and Rebellion be connatural, how comes it to pass that those States or Kingdoms where it hath been establisht or tolerated, have for any time been free from broils and commotions?*] A. 1. It may be 'twas because though their minds were always enclined (by their principles) to rebellion, yet they had not power and opportu-

nity to act ſuitably to thoſe inclinations, with hopes of ſucceſs. 'Twere a ſad thing indeed, if Rebels ſhould be able at all times to put their traiterous Deſigns in execution. 2. It ſuffices (in reference to the grand Queſtion now diſputed) if Presbyterian ſpirits are prone to Rebellion, in caſe their way of Worſhip *be not either eſtabliſht or tolerated.* For they deſerve not to be ſo much as tolerated in any Kingdom, that will, when they have power, rebel againſt Kings, if they be not tolerated. 3. If this *Quare* implies any good proof, that Presbytery and Rebellion is not connatural (by which he means, I ſuppoſe, not uſually conjoyn'd) it does as ſtrongly imply, that Jeſuitiſm and Rebellion are not connatural, ſince thoſe States and Kingdoms where Jeſuits have been tolerated, have for ſome time been free from broils and commotions. It follows:

[*Or how comes it to paſs that Presbyterians have never diſclaimed or abandoned their lawful Prince?*] As if (to let paſs other Inſtances) Engliſh Presbyterians did not diſclaim and abandon the late King, *when they denied him to be in a condition to Govern,* (H. of Comm. Decl. 28. *Nov.* 1646.) *when they denied him the exerciſe of that power in the Militia, which themſelves acknowledged did belong unto him:* (Veritas incorcuſſa, *p.* 147. 168.) *When they affirmed that the Soveraign power reſided in both Houſes of Parliament; that the King had no Negative voice; that whatſoever the two Houſes ſhould Vote, was not by Law to be queſtioned, either by the King or Subjects;*

jects; that it belonged to them only to judge of the Law. (*Declar. of May* 26. 1642.) as if likewise they did not make others to disclaim and abandon him, by making them swear that *they would neither directly nor indirectly adhere unto or willingly assist the King in his War and Cause.* But he proceeds.

[*How comes it to pass that they have never ceased to solicit and supplicate his regards and favour? even when their power hath been at the highest, and his sunk lowest?*] Whereas I read in *Philips* his *Veritas inconcussa* (his Book that proves K. *Charles* I. no man of bloud) these words, *p.* 124. *Instead of offering any thing which was like to bring peace, they* (the Presbyterian Lords and Commons) *caused men and women in the first year of their war to be killed, because they did but petition them to accept of a peace: And in the third and fourth year of their war plundered and robbed them that petitioned them but to hearken to it: And put out of Office and made all as Delinquents in the seventh year of their war that did but petition them for a Treaty with the King, and refused all the Kings many, very many messages for peace, not only when he was at the highest of his success in the war, but when he was at the lowest, and a prisoner to them, and conjured them as they would answer it at the dreadful day of judgment to pity the bleeding condition of his Kingdomes and People, and send propositions of peace unto him; and years and half-years, and more than a whole year together after the battel at* Naseby (*insomuch*

much as their fellow-Rebels the Scotch Commissioners did heavily complain of it) were at several times trifled away and spent before any propositions could be made ready. Was this perpetually to supplicate their lawful Princes regards and favour? And *p.* 126. *We are told they were so unwilling to have any peace at all, as that 6 or 7 Messengers or Trumpeters could come from the King before they could be at leisure, or so mannerly as to answer one of them: but this or that message from the King was received and read, and laid by till a week or when they would after.* And *p.* 128, 129. *When they did treat they desired the granting of such propositions as were purposely contrived and stood upon to hinder a peace; and were not to be asked or granted by any that could but entitle themselves to the least part of reason or humanity,* &c. And *p.* 68. *The King complains that although he had used all ways and means to prevent the distractions and dangers of the Kingdom, all his labours had been fruitless, that not so much as a Treaty earnestly desired by him, could be obtained (though he disclaimed all his Proclamations and Declarations, and the Erecting of his Standard as against his Parliament) unless he should denude himself of all force to defend him from a visible strength marching against him. And when the business of the Treaty (1647 as I suppose) came into discourse, the Assembly of Divines quickly resolved (all of them but four) to be against it.* (See considerations touching the present Factions in the King's Dominions, *p.* 6.) And yet this Brazen-face

zen-face would perſwade us that Presbyterians never ceaſed to ſolicit and ſupplicate the Kings regards and favour. It ſeems their voting (1647) *that they would receive no more meſſages from the King, and that no man ſhould preſume to bring any from him, and that they would make no farther applications and addreſſes to him*, was ſo far from being a diſclaiming and abandoning him, that 'twas not ſo much as a ceaſing to ſupplicate his regards and favour (*ſtatuimus i. e. abrogamus*) what ſhall be done unto thee, O thou falſe Tongue and ridiculous Flatterer? The other part of his Quære is, [*How comes it to paſs that the Preſbyterians ſuffered themſelves rather to be trodden under foot, than to comply with men of violence in changing the Government?*] A. 1. 'Twas becauſe they were unable to make their parts good againſt thoſe men of violence (here intended.) Indeperdents had cheated them out of that power which before they had. 2. Themſelves were *the men of violence* that did firſt of all really change the Goverment by acting without and fighting againſt the Kings Perſon and Authority. Independents took away *the name* [*King*] but Presbyterians had long before deſtroyed *the* [*thing.*] 3. 'Twere no great wonder if Preſbyterians ſuffered themſelves to be trodden under foot (when they could not help it) rather than comply with thoſe that would not advance the Presbyterian Intereſt; but what's this to the objection *of Rebellion and Diſobedience?* Does it follow that *they did not rebel againſt the King* becauſe

becauſe *they ſuffered themſelves to be trodden under foot* by Independents? but 4. 'Tis ſomewhat hard to underſtand what Presbyterians mean when they ſay they ſuffered themſelves *to be trodden under foot.* None can properly be ſaid to ſuffer themſelves to be ill uſed, but thoſe that are able to repel that ill uſage if they pleaſe, which Presbyterians being not able to do when Independents had the power of the ſword, they are very fond ſelf-flatterers thus to apologize for themſelves, which I ſpeak only on ſuppoſition that they were ill uſed and trodden under foot, but that there is any Truth in that ſuppoſition (thus indefinitely expreſt) is more than I believe, unleſs they imagined themſelves trodden under foot and ill uſed becauſe they were not ſuffered to domineer over and ſtill to rule the whole Nation as they liſted; as if all men were trodden under foot or caſt out on the Dunghill (like unſavoury ſalt) that are not ſuffered to ſit in the Throne and uſurp the Scepter of Majeſty. For what elſe were Presbyterians deprived of when the Government was changed? Did they not ſtill enjoy *their lives* and (in a far higher degree than Loyal Subjects) *their Liberties? their Lands* alſo and *livings*, and *their Sacrilegious Purchaſes?* and beſides all this were not Lay-Presbyterians continued in and advanced to Civil offices and places of Truſt: and were not other Presbyterians Maſters of Colledges and Halls in the Univerſities, and continued in their Fellowſhips there? as likewiſe Presbyterian Parſons in their fat Bene-

fices

fices in City and Countrey? and had they not the liberty to exercise whatsoever spiritual power they pleased to claim and vindicate to themselves over their Parishioners? Whence I conclude, that the meaning of those words must (as to the generality of Presbyterians) be this: They suffered themselves *to be trodden under foot*, that is, *to live, to be kept out of prison, to reap the profits of the Lands in their possessions, whether well or ill gotten, whether by the robbing of God and his Church of their sacred Revenues, or others of that which legally belonged unto them; to be Mayors, Bailiffs, Sheriffs, Justices of the Peace, Constables, &c.* And the Presbyterian Ministers in the University, City, and Countrey suffered themselves *to be trodden under foot*, that is, *to be continued in those Headships, Fellowships, Parsonages, Rectories, Cures, which by Law belonged unto, and were illegally, unrighteously plundered from other men; and to enjoy the liberty of excommunicating (in their respective Parishes) whom they pleased, and excluding as many as they pleased from the priviledge of both Sacraments.* But sure if Royalists had been so favourably used by Presbyterians as Presbyterians were by Independents, they would never have been so ingratefully and nonsensically querulous, as to say they were trodden under foot.] In a Pamphlet printed 1648. called [The Pulpit-Incendiary] and directed against Mr. *Calamy*, --- *Case*, --- *Cawton*, --- *Cranford*, --- and other *Sion-Colledge*-Preachers, there are these words, *p.* 45. *You complain of your misery,*

ſery, bondage and ſlavery, of oppreſſions, ſorrows and troubles of the Church, that is doubtleſs of the Church Presbyterian, and no other. What doth ail you? what troubles you? who doth oppreſs you? Have you not Authority on your ſide? have you not all the Church-livings in the Kingdom? have you not Declaration upon Declaration, Ordinance upon Ordinance, Order upon Order, for to back you? Is there the leaſt ſhew of oppreſſion, ſorrow or cauſe of complaint adminiſtred unto you, except it be becauſe you are not ſuffered to oppreſs, vex and gall your Brethren that joyn not with you? Can you feed upon nothing but blood? yea the blood of your Brethren? that though you have every thing elſe, (that only prohibited) you complain of ſorrow, ſlavery, oppreſſion? Is this your ſlavery and captivity, that you cannot enſlave and lead into captivity? Is this to kill you with the ſword, that you cannot kill your Brethren with the ſword? I add, Is this for Presbyterians to be trodden under foot, that they cannot tread others under foot? Beſides, this Author hath before intimated (p. 45, 55.) that the generality of Presbyterians did at laſt comply with the men of violence in their changing the Government; for they ſubſcribed that Engagement which was deſigned for the defending and maintaining of that change: The great, if not only motive whereunto in all probability was, that they might ſtill keep poſſeſſion of their Livings and livelihoods, and not be outlawed: and yet here he would perſwade us, that Presbyterians (indefinitely) ſuffered them-

themſelves to be trodden under foot, rather than they would comply with thoſe men of violence. So true is that ſaying, *Oportet mendacem eſſe memorem*. *Some* (as he tells us in that *p.* if we may believe him) *utterly refuſed even to the forfeiture of their Preferments, and the hazard of their Livelihoods.* ---- Notwithſtanding which words, 1. There were but ſome only that ſo refuſed. --- 2. Thoſe very ſome might afterwards engage, rather than the forfeiture (occaſioned by their refuſal at firſt) ſhould be taken, or their livelihoods loſt as well as hazarded. I have heard indeed of one Presbyterian Doctor, who rather than he would ſubſcribe the Engagement publickly at *Oxford*, parted with a Headſhip of about 80. *l. per Annum*; but yet the ſame man was ſo providently politick, as to ſubſcribe in the Countrey rather than ſuffer himſelf to be trodden under foot, that is, to have a Living of ſix or ſeven hundred a year taken from him: and it may be there were a few more Presbyterians (*that had Pluralities*) who acted in like manner. But this is no Apology for the generality of Presbyterians, who did not ſo much as *hazard* their livelihoods, or render themſelves liable to be trodden under foot, by refuſing to comply. And as for thoſe eminent Presbyterian Miniſters and others, (ſpoken of in the ſame *p.*) who either hazarded or loſt their lives in combining to bring our Soveraign, that now is, to the rightful poſſeſſion of this Kingdom; it cannot reaſonably be ſaid, that ſuch men ſuffered themſelves to be trodden under foot, ſince by thoſe combi-

combining attempts they opposed and endeavoured to ruine and destroy those men of violence that trod them under foot. Nor can they properly or justly be said to suffer themselves to be trodden under foot, who do not suffer it meekly and patiently, without railing at or reviling those that tread them under. Whereas if the carriage of Presbyterian Ministers generally was like that which is reported of the Ministers of *London* in 1648. (when they supposed that the men of violence were about to change the Government) they made it their business to inveigh against those men of violence in sharp and bitter language. For the Author of the Pulpit-Incendiary tells us, that [*the London-Ministers (were so far from suffering themselves humbly, peaceably, and patiently to be trodden under foot, that their) Tongues were sharpned like Serpents, Adders poyson was under their Lips, stinging and poysoning the name and repute of the Army*, p. 16. *calling them a Rebellious Army, a generation of Vipers, a Viperous brood, &c. And that on Sabbath-days and Fast-days in Preaching and Praying they still girded at the Parliament (viz. the Independent majority) as men that declined their Solemn League and Covenant, hindred reformation, minded nothing but their own Interest.* He tells us also, p. 14. *That the morning Lectures which they called the Ark of God in their frequent removals moneth after moneth, from place to place, were so modelled and constituted, that in them a lamentable slaughter was made of the sweet affections of love, kindness,*

kindness, gentleness, goodness, patience each toward other, p. 2. *That that Ark of theirs seems frequently to be drawn — by Bulls of* Basan, *— tossing and goring the Parliament, and Army, and their dissenting Brethren, from day to day, maliciously fomenting contentions, strifes and divisions*, p. 3. *That the* London-*Ministers did by conjunction of Counsels, and debates in* Sion-Colledge (London's, *nay*, England's *distemper*) *conceive sinful resolution to engage and tamper privately with chief Citizens in publick places, as Common-Council-men, &c. and publickly in Pulpit and Press stirring up the people by all possible means, under the pretence of the glory of God, a blessed Reformation, the keeping of the Covenant, &c. to set all together by the ears — and raise a new War*, p. 18, 19.

From which premises, I may, for ought I see, well enough conclude, that this Author instead of pretending that Presbyterians suffered themselves rather to be trodden under foot, than to comply with men of violence in changing the Government, should (in Truth and Justice) have thus represented them — That rather than they would comply with the men of violence, when they presumed they were about to change the Government, they endeavoured to prevent the being trodden under foot by them, by imbittering mens spirits against them in their preachments and direful Prayers, by sowing the seeds of contention and division, and by inflaming mens minds to take Arms, resist and destroy them — and when

notwithſtanding all ſuch *Engliſh* and *Scotch* endeavours, Independents had effected the change of thoſe ſmall remains and parcels of the Engliſh Government, which Presbyterian violence had left unchanged, that Party generally did by degrees ſo far comply, even with that change alſo, that rather than they would be trodden under foot, outlawed and ſequeſtred, they engaged to be faithful to the Commonwealth of *England*, as then eſtabliſht by the men of violence, without King or Houſe of Lords; it ſeems they who thus act are ſaid (*in the Presbyterian dialect*) to ſuffer themſelves to be trodden under foot. And now judge whether *Manimus* muſt not here again ſignifie *abrogamus*.

Let us (as our Author proceeds) further examine. *Are the perſons that adhere to Prelacy more conſcientious in duty to God and Man, than thoſe that affect Presbytery? Are the former only ſober, juſt, and godly, and the latter vicious, unrighteous, profane?*] A. Though I could ſpeak ſomething to theſe Queſtions from my own experience, having lived both in Epiſcopal and Presbyterian Families and places, and being acquainted with divers Perſons, Miniſters, and others of both perſwaſions, yet becauſe compariſons of this kind are odious, I ſhall anſwer only in reference to the main thing in Queſtion, that [*there's more reaſon of State*] *for the protecting a drunken Royaliſt than a ſober Rebel, and yet I am fully perſwaded, that neither of them ſo remaining have holineſs enough in this world to render them*

capable

capable of happineſs in the next. Nor do I doubt, but it may be as much the lot of ſome Traiterous ſpirits to be ſober, as 'tis (if this Author tell truth in the following lines) of ſome that adhere to Prelacy to be loyal; but whether I have not already ſaid enough to prove, that Presbyterian principles encline to Rebellion, and the principles of Engliſh Prelatiſts to Loyalty, let all impartial Readers judge. If this be not anſwer ſufficient to thoſe *Queries*, I ſhall ſupply the defects of it with tranſcribing (for this Authors ſake) a paſſage or two out of the writings of his fellow-Rebels. The firſt ſhall be out of *William Sedgwick's* [Leaves of the Tree of Life for the healing of the Nations, *p.* 36.] *Of the two 'tis more ſtrange to ſee that the Presbyterian, who the other day was oppreſt by the Biſhop for his conſcience in point of the Sabbath,* &c. *who could not (long ſince) live without the favour of the Biſhop, ſhould now thruſt out thoſe under whom he lived for not taking the Covenant, which is contrary to their conſcience; and ſhew leſs favour to them than he received from them, and do that which he condemned in others; and this upon weak and fleſhly grounds, admiring his own way, which is to pray and preach longer and more than another, to be ſtrict in repetition on Sabbath-days, and ſome ſuch poor formal things; to ſet up this as the power of Godlineſs and Reformation, to the ruine of another, who it may be is a man of more juſtice, ability and wiſdom, more ſobriety, more ſtability, more patience and conſtancy in ſuffering,* &c.

The other shall be out of *J. Price's Clerico-Classicum*, p. 40. *Have we not cause to judge better of many of the Prelatical party (who being men of learning and conscience, and never so violent against their opposers in Church and State as your selves (you Presbyterian Ministers of* London*) making no disturbances, rents, divisions, Factions by Pulpit and Press as you do, from day to day, (as all men observe) that being conscious to themselves of the many Oaths, Vows, Covenants that they have made of subjection and obedience unto Bishops, the then establisht Church Government, Book of Common Prayer, Homilies, Canons, &c. cannot take the Solemn League and Covenant, and rather chuse to lose their Livings and Livelihoods, committing themselves, Wives and Children to the mercy of God, having no visible means of subsisting, than to break the peace of their Consciences, by taking an Oath, Vow or Covenant contrary to all their former Oaths before satisfaction received) than of you or some of you that presently turn'd Presbyterians, cast away Episcopacy, took the Covenant, and having taken it, turn it and wind it, wring it and wrest it, making it to look East and West, North and South, as your Interest works with King, Parliament or Army, or against them all? And this,* says he, *is not my saying only, but it is* vox Populi, *the late King, the Lords, the Commons, the City, the Countrey, the whole Kingdom observed it.*

To these I shall add some passages of the like import out of Dr. *Owen*, in his [*Mortification*

of

of Sin in Believers] p. 29. *There is indeed,* says he, *a broad light fallen upon the men of this generation, and together therewith many spiritual gifts communicated, which with some other considerations have wonderfully enlarged the bounds of Professors and Profession* — *Hence there is a noise of Religion and Religious duties in every Corner preaching in abundance; and that not in an empty, light, trivial, and vain manner as formerly, but to a good proportion of a spiritual Gift; so that if you will measure the number of Believers by light, gifts and profession, the Church may have cause to say, who hath born me all these? But now if you will take the measure of them by this great discriminating Grace of Christians, perhaps you will find their number not so multiplyed: Where almost is that Professor who owes his conversion to these days of Light, and so talks and professes at such a rate of spirituality as few in former days were in any measure acquainted with* — *that doth not give evidence of a miserably unmortified heart? If vain spending of time, talents, unprofitableness in mens places, envy, strife, variance, emulations, wrath, pride, worldliness, selfishness be badges of Christians; we have them on us and among us in abundance.* The same Dr. in his Book of Temptations, p. 64. asks this Question, *would any one have thought it possible that such and such professors in our days should have fallen into ways of self, of flesh, of the World; to play at cards, Dice, revel, dance, to neglect family, closet duties, to be proud, haughty, ambitious, worldly, covetous, oppressive?*

or that they should be turned away after foolish vain, ridiculous opinions, deserting the Gospel of Christ? in which two lies the great temptation that is come on us the inhabitants of this world to try us. But doth not every man see that this is come to pass? and may we not see how it is come to pass? Some loose empty Professors that had never more than a Form of Godliness when they had served their turn of that began the way to them; then others began a little to comply, and to please the flesh in so doing; this by little and little hath reached even the Top-boughs and branches of our profession, until almost all flesh hath corrupted its ways, and he that departs from these iniquities makes his name a prey if not his person. And p. 55, 56. How full is the world of specious pretences and pleadings? as —— the liberty and freedom of Christians delivered from a bondage-frame —— This is a door that in my own observation I have seen sundry go out at into sensuality and Apostasie, beginning at a light conversation, proceeding to a neglect of the Sabbath, publick and private duties, ending in dissoluteness and profaneness, and then there is leaving off publick things to providence —— These and the like considerations joyned with the ease and plenty, the greatness and promotion of professors have so brought things about, that whereas we have by providence *shifted places with the men of the world, we have* by sin *shifted spirits with them also; we are like a plantation of men carried into a forreign Countrey, in a short space they degenerate from the manners of the people from whence they came, and*

and fall into those of the countrey whereinto they are brought; as if there were something in the Soil and the Air that transformed them. Give me leave a little to follow my similitude: He that should see the prevailing Party of these Nations, many of those in rule, power, favour, with all their adherents, and remember that they were a Colony of Puritans, whose habitation was in a low place, as the Prophet speaks of the City of God, translated by an high hand to the mountains they now possess; cannot but wonder how soon they have forgot the customes, manners, ways of their own old people, and are cast into the mould of them that went before them in the places whereunto they are translated. I speak of us all, especially of us who are among the lowest of the people, where perhaps this iniquity doth most abound, what were those before us that we are not? what did they which we do not? Prosperity hath slain the foolish and wounded the wise. Thus the (then) Dean of Christ-Church.

Let's now return to the Rector of *Bramshot*.

[*Their principles*, says he, p. 54. 64. *whose cause is now pleaded, if faithfully received and kept, will make good men and good Christians, and therefore cannot but make good Subjects; when men have learnt to fear God they will honour the King indeed, and none are more observant of Righteous Laws than they that are most a Law to themselves; yea, their pattern and practice will be a Law to many others, and consequently a main help to Civil Government in a Christian Nation.*]

If all this be true, then Engliſh Presbyterians have not faithfully received and kept Presbyterian Principles; for I am ſure they have not been good Subjects becauſe Traytors and Rebels againſt their Soveraign Lord: and therefore I ſhall make bold to conclude from this Author's premiſſes, that they have been neither good Chriſtians nor good men: I am ſure they diſhonoured the King, for as his Majeſty complained in his Declaration concerning Levyes, *his Authority was deſpiſed by them and as much as in them lay taken from him; and reviled in Pulpits and Preſſes by Perſons immediately under their protection, and of their recommendation.* And the *London*-Pulpitmen (if *John Price* ſpeak truth in his *Clerico-Claſſicum*, p. 53.) told the people that *the King was a man of blond; and took hold of all whiſpering, hearſays and probabilities of his wickedneſs to make him odious to the people:* And therefore by this *John Corbet*'s good leave, I ſhall conclude that they had not then learn'd *to fear God.* That they were a Law to themſelves I eaſily grant, but 'twas juſt as Traytors and other Malefactors uſe to be, who trample under foot the righteous Laws of a Nation, becauſe inconſiſtent with their rebellious, ambitious, and ungodly deſigns; and are reſolved to follow the Law of their own wills; and in this Presbyterians were patterns to many others, and conſequently a main help to the Independents in their deſtroying thoſe remnants of the Civil Government of this Nation which themſelves had (*for want of time to finiſh*

their

their mischievous enterprizes) left undemolished. But this Egregious Parasite has not done yet; for he would fain delude his Reader with another Apologetick in behalf of his Party. [*Whosoever they be that teach blind obedience, Presbyterians teach Faith and Holiness; as also Obedience active in all lawful things, and passive in things unlawful enjoyned by the higher Power.*]

A. I do not understand or believe that there is any such diametral opposition between *blind obedience* on one hand and *faith and holiness* on the other, but that the same Persons, Presbyterians as well as Jesuits may teach both. I rather believe that blind obedience in matters prescribed by and agreeable to the word of God, will sooner bring a man to heaven than all that Faith and Holiness which too many Modern presbyterian Boutefeaus have taught either by their Doctrine or Practice. But the latter clause [*that they teach obedience active in all lawful things, and passive in things unlawful enjoyned by the higher power*] may justly make an impartial Reader that reflects upon their actions for several years together to wonder what this man means by [*the higher power*] by [*things unlawful*] by [*obedience active and passive.*] If in the days of the Long Parliament, Presbyterian Doctrines and practices in this point were suitable and correspondent, the words must be thus paraphrased: Presbyterians taught obedience active in things unlawful enjoyned by the two Houses (whom Mr. *Herle's* (as 'tis reported) seditious invention made (only) co-ordinate

ordinate with the King) and disobedience active even to bloudy Rebellion in things lawful enjoyned by the King, whom by Oath they acknowledged to be the only Supreme Governour of this Kingdom. I have read in *Philips* his *Veritas inconcussa*, p. 23. that (in 1642) *Presbyterian Pulpits flamed with seditious invectives against the King, and incitements to Rebellion, and that the people running headlong into it had all manner of countenance and encouragement, but those Ministers that preacht obedience and sought to prevent Rebellion, were sure to be imprisoned and put out of their places for it.*] Was this for Presbyterians to preach either Faith or Holiness, or Obedience active to the King? or were those men so good Subjects, so good Christians, as either actively or passively to obey his Majesty, or preach such obedience, when they took themselves and exhorted others to take that Solemn League and Covenant, which the King in his Proclamation against it calls a Traiterous and Seditious combination against himself and the establisht Religion and Laws of the Kingdom? [*We do therefore*, says his Majesty, *strictly charge and command all our loving Subjects of what degree or quality soever, upon their Allegiance, that they presume not to take the said seditious and traiterous Covenant. And we do likewise hereby forbid and inhibit all our Subjects to impose, administer or tender the said Covenant, as they and every of them will answer the contrary at their utmost and extremest peril.*]

What

What therefore was the taking of this Covenant and tendering of it to others? was it obedience? either active, or passive, to the King? No, but on the contrary, 'twas active disobedience to his Majesties command; and the taking up Arms against the King in prosecution of this Covenant thus taken, and cursing those that did not, was Treason and Rebellion by the Lawes of the Land, and damnable resistance by the Law of Christ. And these and other Presbyterian practices were such a palpable contradiction to the Oaths of Supremacy and Allegiance, that in some late reflexions on those Oaths, 'tis admired with what face Presbyterians can now either take or urge them. *It's a wonderful mystery*, p. 41. *how it should come to pass, that our English Presbyterians, &c. should (especially now of late) with so much willingness and greediness themselves swallow these Oaths, and so clamorously urge them on others, Is it because the Oath of Supremacy has so peculiar a conformity to their principles, and that of Allegiance to their practices? or that they are so ready and pressing to disclaim and condemn all, that themselves have done these last twenty years?*— And a little after: *Who ever heard or knew to flow from the Tongue, or drop from the Pen of a Presbyterian, so Christian a Position as is sincerely avouched both by English Protestants and the general body of* Roman *Catholicks*, viz. *that even in case a Christian or Heathen Prince should make use of his Civil Power to persecute Truth, that power ought not upon any pretences to be actively resisted*

sisted by violence or force of Arms, but though they cannot approve, they must at least patiently suffer the effects of his mis-used Authority, leaving the judgment to God only? If this Rector can answer this Question in the affirmative, and then prove it true of any one Covenanting Presbyterian, Scotch or English, within the compass of this last twenty years, let him, I shall be glad to see it. Whether he can do so much or no I doubt, (as I do likewise, whether that Reflecter can prove that that Position, as he has worded it, is owned by *the general body of* Roman *Catholicks*;) but that he cannot do it of Presbyterians generally, or any considerable number of them, I am pretty well assured: if he can, 'twill follow that the generality of Presbyterians, or a considerable number of them most wretchedly detained that Truth in unrighteousness, and for several years together acted most horrid things contrary to their Light, Knowledge and Conscience. But 'tis observable, that this crafty Impostor instead of [*proving*] that Presbyterians teach obedience active in things lawful, and passive in things unlawful enjoyned *by* [*the King's Majesty*] [*affirms only*] that they teach such obedience in things enjoyned by the [*Higher power*] not telling us, whether they mean the higher power *de jure, or de facto only*; nor whether their Doctrine will not comprehend the higher power *de facto*, though themselves acknowledge it no power *de jure*, if so be that power will in the main comply with the advancement of the Presbyterian Interest,

reſt. What the presbyterians meant by *the higher power* in the late diviſions, was too evident by their practiſes, *viz. that parcel minor, part of the Long Parliament which favoured Presbytery, which oppoſed the King and made War againſt him, which elected a multitude of new Members, by vertue of a counterfeit* (*treaſonable*) *Seal. Prove that the King was the Higher power in the time of the Diviſions*, ſays Mr. *Baxter*, (Pref. to his Holy Commonwealth, p. 23.) *They declared* May 26. 1642. *that the Soveraign power reſides in both Houſes of Parliament*; as the Author of *Veritas Inconcuſſa* quotes them, p. 29. who alſo p. 91. informs us, *That the Parliament could not be called a Parliament, when they had driven away the King, who is the Head and Life of it; nor they be ſaid to be two Houſes of Parliament, when there was not at that time when they firſt raiſed a War above a third part of the Houſe of Peers, nor the half part of the Houſe of Commons remaining in them; and what thoſe few did in their abſence, was either forced by a Faction of their own, or a party of Seditious* Londoners; *for indeed the War rightly conſidered, was not betwixt the Parliament and the King, but a War made by a Factious and Seditious party of the Parliament againſt the King, and the major part of the Parliament.*] So that a factious, ſeditious part of a Parliament was heretofore owned by Presbyterians as [the Higher power.] Nay, the chief Presbyterian Advocate was ſuch a learned man, ſuch a good Subject and Chriſtian, he did ſo fear God

God and honour the King, as to be able and willing to distinguish between the supreme Governour and the supreme Power of this Nation, (Sover. power of Parl. *p.* 104.) and to teach, that *the King was indeed the Supreme Governour, but the Parliament* (by which he understood those two Houses) *was the Supreme Power*: (*which is very strange*, says Judge *Jenkins*, *for who can govern without power?* p. 57.) Whence all that I shall conclude is, 1. That this part of the Authors Apology is rather an implicit confession and proof of the crime objected than an Argument of Presbyterian Innocence. And 2. That it concerns his Majesty, before he resolve to protect and encourage Presbyterians, to catechize them very particularly and strictly, touching those Loyal principles which this *J. C.* pretends to be embraced by them, that so it may appear, whether when they take the Oath of Supremacy, they do it not with that Jesuitical, or more than Jesuitical Equivocation just now mentioned, or with such a mental reservation, as will infer their approving (now as well as in the late Wars) of that Treasonable distinction between the King's personal and politick capacity, and that damnable and damned opinion (as it seems *Cook*'s Reports call it, *B.* 7. in *Calvin*'s Case) *that Homage and the Oath of Allegiance, was more by reason of the Kings Crown, his Politick capacity, than by reason of the Person of the King*: whence they inferred these detestable consequences: 1. If the King demean not himself by reason, his Leiges are

bound

bound by Oath to remove him. 2. Seeing the King could not be reformed by Suit at Law, that it ought to be done *per asperè*, by force. 3. That his Leiges are bound to govern in aid of him: all which were condemned by two Parliaments, one in the reign of *Edw.* 2. and the other 1 *Edw.* 3. *ch.* 1. (See *Sheringham's* Remonstrance of the King's right, *p.* 75.) *And yet all these three damnable, detestable and execrable consequences are the grounds whereupon the present time (of the late Wars) relies, and the principles whereupon the two Houses found their cause*, says J. *Jenkins*, *p.* 10. For ought I know Presbyterians own these principles to this day, and so are prepared in mind again to teach men actively to disobey the King, yea, and to dethrone his Majesty, by acknowledging two such Houses (and obeying them as) the Higher power, whensoever they can by their disturbing Arts and Influences (in raising and countenancing barbarous, and seditious Tumults) divide the King from the Houses, the Loyal part of the Houses from the Disloyal, and then patch them up again by Treasonable Elections, and so pack together a company of men, whom they will be bold enough to call a Parliament. If all Presbyterians are of the same belief with *Zachary Crofton* (in his *Berith Anti-Baal*) they are still of opinion, *That the Covenant-imposing and taking Lords and Commons were a most lawful, rightly called, and constituted Assembly, the Princes and principal Rulers of the people*, (though themselves swear that the King

is

is the only supreme Governour) (*p.* 7.) *that they were the Princes,* [*yea more*] *the body of the people,* p. 30. *That their Oath* (Covenant) *was the most positive authentick repeal of any Laws obliging to the contrary,* p. 31. 51. *This,* says he, *Mr.* Crofton *and all rational men do believe, That succeeding Parliaments are bound to repeal those Laws which establish the thing which those Lords and Commons had sworn to extirpate,* p. 31. *That their swearing those things as the collective body of the Nation, binds all posterity, who shall any way succeed into that national capacity.* 'Tis no reason of State for the King (when he is able to suppress and reject them,) to protect and encourage any Party of men thus principl'd and dispos'd: and therefore reason of State will put his Majesty upon a curious and diligent enquiry, whether Presbyterians and others retain these and the like principles, (*as that the Long Parliament is yet in being,* which is favour'd also, *p.* 52.) and will oblige him to deny them protection and encouragement, till they renounce and abjure all such damnable and pernicious maxims.

In the following Lines, *p.* 55---65. this Author would fain perswade us that Presbyterians must needs be good Subjects to a Christian King, because [*Profaneness, intemperance, revellings, outrages, and filthy lewdness were not at any time in the memory of the present Age held under more restraint than in the late distracted times; the special reason whereof was because a practical Ministry*

nistry was more thick set throughout the Nation, and the places where Presbyterian Ministers had the greatest influence were most reformed and civilized, and the orderly walking of Religious Persons did keep others more within compass.]

Which is no better than *non causa pro causâ*, for 'tis evident enough that that (supposed) effect must be attributed to Presbyterian *Ordinances* not Sermons, and (the Executors of them) Presbyterian Magistrates, (I mean Mayors, Bayliffs, Justices of the peace, Constables, illegally chosen) as the special principal cause, without whose coercive power Presbyterian Ministers might have preacht their hearts out before they had wrought the Reformation here talkt of, especially considering 1. That himself *p.* 65. pleads for *the annexing of some temporal damage and penalty to Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction, because spiritual censures* (and then say I much more Sermons) *pertaining only to the Conscience may be too little regarded.* And 2. That 'twas easy enough for many filthy, prophane, intemperate persons thus to bespeak many of those practical Ministers, (as S. *Paul* did the Pharisaical Jew:) Behold thou art called a Presbyterian, and restest in the Bible, and makest thy boast of God, and knowest his will, and approvest the things that are excellent, being instructed out of the Law, and art confident that thou thy self art a guide of the Blind, a light of them who are in darkness, an instructer of the foolish, a teacher of

Babes, who haſt the form of knowledge and of the truth in the Law: Thou therefore who teacheſt another teacheſt thou not thy ſelf? Thou that preacheſt a man ſhould not ſteal, doſt thou year after year reap the profits of that Living which by Law belongs to another, who was plundered of it by illegal violence? and that becauſe he was a more loyal Subject than thy ſelf? Thou that abhorreſt Idols, doſt thou juſtifie and approve of the committing Sacriledge? the robbing of God as well as man? Thou that gloryeſt in the Law (of the firſt Table at leaſt,) by breaking the Law (of the ſecond Table) diſhonoureſt thou God? Knoweſt thou not that he that ſaid, Thou ſhalt not commit adultery, ſaid alſo, Honour thy Father and thy Mother, Thou ſhalt not Kill nor Steal, nor bear falſe witneſs, nor covet other mens goods? Thou thundereſt out rebukes and threatneſt damnation againſt us that are Adulterers, Fornicators, Unclean, Drunkards, Revellers, and yet thou thy ſelf art notoriouſly guilty of thoſe (other) crimes which (together with theſe) are uſually and equally forbidden and condemned in the ſame or the next verſe, and the doers of them ſentenc'd to Hell. When we lewd, prophane, and intemperate perſons read in the Old Teſtament that *Rebellion is as the ſin of Witchcraft, and ſtubbornneſs is as iniquity and Idolatry*: And in the New Teſtament, that *covetous Perſons, revilers, extortioners are in the number of thoſe unrighteous men that ſhall not inherit the kingdom of God*: that they alſo who are guilty of *idolatry, witchcraft,*

witchcraft, hatred, variance, emulation, wrath, strife, sedition, murder, shall be excluded the kingdom of Heaven, as well as adulterers, fornicators, drunkards: and when 'tis evident to us from your practises, that you Presbyterian Ministers have for many years been (in a Scripture account) Wizards and Idolaters, because you have behaved your selves *stubbornly and rebellionsly* against the command and Authority of God and the King, *contentionsly, wrathfully and seditionsly* against the inferiour Governours sent by him as the supreme, that you have *born false witness* against those that were loyal and obedient Subjects as Traytors, Incendiaries, &c. And then have manifested your selves so *insatiably covetous* of their goods and legal possessions, that some of your party have enjoyed plundered goods, and sequestred livings, legally belonging to honest Royalists; and besides all this you have prayed for the prosperity of Presbyterian Armies, and encouraged them to fight against the King, and cursed those that did not, and the more of the Kings Friends your forces killed, the more heartily you gave thanks to God, and by such approving compliances are *guilty of the bloud of thousands of the Kings Loyal Subjects, and consequently of so many murders.* To kill any man in war without Authority derived from him or them that have legal power to make war, being *murder*; and that your Presbyterian Lords and Commons had no such power (as to that war which they made and you abetted) is evident

enough from this, that a Law of the Land, 25 *Edw.* 3. *c.* 2. makes it Treason to levy war against the King in his Realm, or to be adherent to the Kings enemies in his Realm, giving them aid or comfort in the Realm or elsewhere: Since also 'tis no better than murder to kill or put those men to death, whose lives (as well as goods, lands, &c.) the Law hath taken special care to preserve, you are by your approbation partakers of their sin who murdered such men. That you approved the taking away their lives who adhered to the King in the late wars, we presume you will not deny (yea you covenanted to do them mischief under the Notion of Malignants, Incendiaries, and Evil Instruments.) That the Law of the Land saves them harmless, is evident from 11 *Henry* 7. *c.* 1. Wherein 'tis declared *to be against all Laws, Reason and good conscience, that Subjects going with their Soveraign Lord in Wars, attending upon him in his person, or being in other places by his commandment within this land or without, should lose or forfeit any thing for doing their duty or Service of Allegiance.* Wherein likewise 'twas enacted, *that no manner of person or persons whatsoever — that attend upon the King and Soveraign Lord of this Land, for the time being, in his person, and do him true and faithful service of Allegiance in the same, or be in other places by his commandment in his wars within this land or without, that for the said deed and true duty of Allegiance, he or they be in no wise convict or attaint of high Treason, nor of other offences*

ces for that cauſe by Act of Parliament; or otherwiſe by any Proceſs of Law, whereby he or any of them ſhall loſe or forfeit life, lands, tenements, rents, poſſeſſions, hereditaments, goods, chattels or any other things, but to be for that deed and ſervice utterly diſcharged of any vexation, trouble or loſs: And if any Act or Acts, or other Proceſs of the Law hereafter thereupon for the ſame happen to be made contrary to this Ordinance, that then that Act or Acts or other Proceſs of Law whatſoever they ſhall be, ſtand and be utterly void. Now you Presbyterian Preachers being thus guilty, with what face can you reprove our prophaneneſs, or judge us to Hell for thoſe vices which are but motes in compariſon of thoſe beams which an ordinary ſight may diſcern in your own eyes? and tell us if you can why theſe practices of yours do not give us juſt cauſe to ſuſpect that either *you are very ſcandalouſly ignorant* of the moſt material and concerning portions of holy Scripture, or that *you do not give any credit to them* (and then why do you ſeek to affright us from our intemperateneſs and lewdneſs with ſuch *mormo's* as your ſelves are too ſturdy to be ſcar'd with?) or elſe that *you have ſome Salvoes and comfortable reſerves* which might keep us from deſpair, and make us preſume (upon Heaven) as well as your ſelves, if you would pleaſe to acquaint us with them? And therefore till your ſelves are more reformed and civilized, and walk more orderly towards God and the King, towards the Laws of Nature and Scrip-

ture, and this Nation, you cannot (in modesty) expect that your Sermons should prevail upon us to restrain our debauchery, or convert us from dissoluteness and disorder. And now let this Author prove if he can (as strongly as he boldly affirms) that the men whom he pleads for (who are such bad Christians) must needs be good Subjects.

But *p.* 56. The man goes on to prevaricate and abuse his Readers into a good opinion of Presbyterians.

[*Neither are they wandring starrs, a people given to Change, fit to overturn and pull down but not to build up; they do not hang in the air, but build upon a firm ground; they have settled principles consistent with the Rules of Stable Policy. Contrariwise Fanaticks (truly, and not abusively so called) do build Castles in the Air, and are fit Instruments to disturb and destroy and root out, but never to compose and plant and settle, for which cause their Kingdom could never hold long in any time or place of the World. Upon this ground Presbytery, not Sectarian Anarchy hath been assaulted with greatest violence by the more observing Prelatists; against this they have raised their main batteries: This appeared formidable, for 'tis stable and uniform and like to hold if once settled in good earnest.*]

From which heap of words I gather, 1. That the Presbyterian Lords and Commons were Fanaticks truly so called, since they manifested themselves (for several years together) fit instruments

ſtruments to diſturb and deſtroy, and root out the Order, Governours, and Government eſtabliſht by Law; but when they had ſo far diſturbed things, as to deſtroy by Force and Arms, that Form of Policy in Church and State; when they had done fighting againſt the King, and had gotten him into their clutches, inſtead of ſhewing their skill in compoſing, planting and ſetling, they employed their time in building Caſtles in the Air, till the Independent Fanaticks out-witted them, and cunningly jugled that power out of their hands which they had by force and violence wreſted from the hands of his Majeſty and the Laws. --- 2. I gather that the principles of the Anarchical ſectarians are more conſiſtent with the Rules of Stable-policy than thoſe of Presbyterians, becauſe their Kingdom and Tyranny laſted much longer than that of Presbytery. 3. I gather that Prelatiſts had more reaſon to oppoſe Presbytery than ſectarian Anarchy, becauſe (if this Author be in this particular a tell-troth) Presbytery was like to produce a more firm and rooted Schiſm againſt the Biſhops, and a more formidable, becauſe more durable rebellion againſt the King, than ſectarian Anarchy. 4. I conclude, that therefore we have great reaſon to bleſs God, that the Fanaticks routed the Presbyterians, and put a period to the dominion of Presbytery, ſince, if it had once been ſetled in good earneſt, it would either have kept out his Majeſty much longer than ſectarian Anarchy did, or elſe have introduced him upon ſuch *uncivil, inſolent,*

insolent, and imperious terms, as the Scotch Presbytery brought him into that Nation, and would (in probability) have forced him to rest content with an *Isle-of-Wight-titular-Kingship.* But 5. I gather that Reason of State forbids the protecting and encouraging of Presbyterians, since they are not fit to overturn only, and pull down, but also to build up a stable and uniform Tower of Babel, in defiance to the Laws of God and the King; such an one as 'twill concern Heaven it self to take cognizance of, and to secure its own Soveraignty and Supremacy by exerting its wisdom, power, and goodness, in defeating their Counsels, controlling and confounding their ambitious designs. It follows:

[*This Party doth not run so fast, but they know where to stop: they are a number of men so fixt and constant as none more; and a Prince or State shall know where to find them.*]

Whereas, 1. The Presbyterian Lords and Commons declared *April* 9. 1642. that *they intended to take away nothing in the Government and Liturgie of the Church, but what shall be evil and justly offensive, or at least unnecessary and burthensom*; and yet afterwards they wholly extirpated the Government of our Church, and abolisht its Liturgy: (things burdensom, it seems, to them at last, though not justly offensive:) and yet these men are so fixt and constant as none more. 2. His late Majesty, in his Declaration occasioned by the Presbyterian Ordinance, for assessing the Twentieth part of mens Estates, hath left on record

cord ſome notable examples of that Parties fixedneſs and conſiſtency with themſelves. *We have not*, ſays the King, *lately heard of the old Fundamental Laws, which uſed to warrant the Innovations. This Ordinance needs a refuge even below theſe Foundations. They will ſay they cannot manage their undertakings without ſuch extraordinary ways; we think ſo too; but that proves only that they have undertaken ſomewhat, which they ought not to undertake; not that it's lawful for them to do any thing that is convenient for theſe ends. We remembred them long ago, and we cannot do it too often, of that excellent ſpeech of Mr.* Pym's, [*The Law is that which puts a difference between good and evil; between juſt and unjuſt; if you take away the Law, all things will fall into a confuſion; every man will become a Law to himſelf: which in the depraved condition of humane Nature muſt needs produce many great enormities; Luſt will become a Law; and Envy will become a Law; Coveteouſneſs and Ambition will become Laws; and what Dictates, what Deciſions ſuch Laws will produce may eaſily be diſcerned.*] *It may indeed*, ſays his Majeſty, *by the ſad inſtances over the whole Kingdom. But will poſterity believe, that in the ſame Parliament this Doctrine was avow'd with that Acclamation, and theſe Inſtances after produced? that in the ſame Parliament ſuch care was taken, that no man ſhould be committed in what caſe ſoever, without the cauſe of his Impriſonment expreſſed; and that all men ſhould be immediately bailed in all caſes bailable; and during the ſame Parlia-*

Parliament that Alderman Pennington, *or indeed any body else but the sworn Ministers of Justice, should imprison whom they would, and for what they would, and for as long time as they would? That the King should be reproach'd for breach of Priviledge for accusing of Sir* John Hotham *of High Treason, when with force of Arms he kept him out of* Hull, *and despised him to his Face,* because in no case a Member of either House might be committed or accused without leave of that House of which he is a Member; *and yet that during the same Parliament the same Alderman should commit the Earl of* Middlesex *(a Peer of the Realm) the Lord* Buckhurst *(a Member of the House of Commons) to the* Counter *without reprehension: That to* be a Traitor, *which is defin'd, and every man understands, should be no crime; and to be* call'd Malignant, *which no body knows the meaning of, should be ground enough for close Imprisonment: That a Law should be made, that whosoever should presume to take Tonnage and Poundage, without an Act of Parliament, should incur the penalty of a* Præmunire; *and in the same Parliament, that the same Imposition should be laid upon our Subjects, and taken, by an Order of both Houses, without and against our Consent? Lastly, That in the same Parliament, a Law should be made to declare the proceedings and judgment upon Ship-money to be illegal and void, and during that Parliament, that an Order of both Houses shall, upon pretence of Necessity, enable four men to take away from all their Neighbours the Twentieth part of their*

Estates,

Eſtates, according to their diſcretion? Thus his Majeſty. And yet theſe are the men whom a Prince or State ſhall know where to find. I might inſtance in more particulars of the ſame or worſe complexion, as to *Lay-Presbyterians*; but I muſt not paſs over in ſilence ſome of the *Presbyterian Miniſters of London*, to whom *Price* in his *Clerico-Claſſ.* p. 53. ſpeaks thus: *If doubts ariſe concerning reſiſting Kings and Rulers, eſpecially in caſe of Oaths, Vows or Covenants, touching preſervation of the perſon of the King, (as there did from the Solemn League and Covenant) then you are ready to give ſatisfaction, and to tell the people, that that clauſe in the Covenant is to be underſtood not ſimply, but relatively, that is, is not a ſingle, but a complex engagement, not an abſolute, but a conditional clauſe (with many ſuch diſtinctions.) It is for the Kings perſon in the preſervation of our Religion and Liberties; and though the King ſhould be deſtroyed by you, you have notwithſtanding kept your Covenant. But,* p. 54. *when the War is ended, the Enemy vanquiſh'd, the Liberties of the people recovered,* &c. *if they bring not the ſpoil of their victories, and lay them down at your Feet; and if they that ſit at the Stern do not lay aſide all other buſineſs, and do nothing elſe but build your Palaces — then,* p. 55. *you temper your Sermons, and turn your Tongues, your Lines, your Language for the Royal Intereſt — and,* p. 27. *fly to that part and Article of the Covenant, engaging for the preſervation and defence of the King's Majeſties perſon and Autho-*

rity:

rity: and, p. 35. *plead it against the Parliament and Army for purposing to bring the King to Trial:* —*when,* p. 55. *nothing serves but the Army prevails, the King is brought to*—— *Prelatical Presbytery shall not be suffered, what pathetick cries and moans, sighs and groans are heard in your Pulpits, wringing your hands in bitter complaints, that the Land is stained with the blood of our Prince,* &c. *when alas! the Royal party, and many judicious men with them, cannot believe, but that the root of all this bitterness is, that your Crown of Classical Jurisdiction is fallen to the ground.* And, p. 17, 18. *whereas you speak so much of resisting Authority, and fill the ears of your Auditors from day to day, with rebellizing the Army for their late proceedings against the Members, mustering up the same Scriptures, teaching and pressing duty to Authority, which the Prelatical party did formerly urge against you, as that of* Solomon, Fear thou the Lord and the King; Put them in mind to be subject to principalities and powers. Let every Soul be subject to the Higher powers, &c. *Yet we heard not of these things from you, when the mutinous Apprentices and others offered violence upon the Houses,* 1647. *No noise then of such Scriptures; no putting men in mind to be subject to principalities and powers,* —*as if those Scriptures were added since that time. Can you presume that men are so blind, dull and sottish, as not to observe such partial and crafty handling of the Scriptures, Word and will of God? Do not these practices of yours* settle and establish Atheism, irreligion and

profane-

profaneness among men? *making them to look upon Religion, the Gospel, the Word of God, as upon a mere piece of jugling, cheating and deceiving the World*; *and should we take your counsel which you give us from the words of* Solomon, Meddle not with them that are given to change, *we should all turn Separatists from you and your ways, who have been as full of changes as the Vanes of your Steeples, one while stirring up the people against the King, and for the Parliament*; *writing Books, answering objections, and using all manner of endeavours that way (that so the Bishops may be dethroned and you advanced;) witness many of your Sermons preach'd before the Houses and elsewhere*; *another while stirring up the people against the Parliament and for the King (lest the Independents should hinder your advance) as you did of late in your prayers and preaching, expressing greater malignity against the Parliament and their party, and greater zeal for the King and his Interest, than those very Ministers whose places you possess, they being sequestred and cast out for the Tenths of that Anti-Parliamentary malignancy, which you have vented ---- Have you not been for Bishops and against Bishops? for Common Prayer, for Ceremonies and against them? Have you not sworn and subscribed? and subscribed and sworn over and over again and again conformity and subjection hereunto, and yet cast away all, and entred into Vows and Covenants against all? ---* p. 24. *Making your vicissitudes and turnings up and down the subject matter of scorn and contempt and derision both of*

your

your perſons and function; and yet *theſe are the men that a Prince or State may know where to find.* In the Pulpit Incendiary, *p.* 7. I meet with this ſtory touching one Mr. *Edmond Calamy* of *Aldermanbury London*: *That in the times when the Biſhops did bear rule he obeyed their Laws, Canons, Injunctions, Orders and Ceremonies, (we ſay not wearing the Surplice, reading the Service-Book, and Croſſing in Baptiſm, &c. which many honeſt and Godly Miniſters in thoſe dark days did likewiſe perform, but) reading the ſecond Service at the High Altar, preaching in a Surplice and Tippet, bowing at the Name of Jeſus, and ſo zealous an obſerver of times and ſeaſons, that being ſick and weak upon Chriſtmaſs Day, yet with much difficulty he got into the Pulpit, declaring himſelf there to this purpoſe, that he thought himſelf bound in conſcience to ſtrive to preach on that day, leſt the ſtones in the ſtreet ſhould riſe up againſt him: And yet upon the wonderful turn of the times, Ejection of Epiſcopacy and advance of Presbytery, did preſently and without delay not only aſſert the ſame, but inſtructed the people in Presbyterian Principles after ſuch a rate of confidence and skill, as if his Education had been* ſome Superintendent among the Presbyterian Provinces of the Reformed Churches beyond Sea, *and not* ſuch a notorious conformitant unto and notable ſtickler for the Prelates Fooleries (as the Author of that Pamphlet is pleaſed to ſpeak) *in the County of* Suffolk, *in the Kingdome of* England. The ſame man gives us this obſervation,

tion, p. 7. *That as the Conſtitution of publick Affairs varies among us, ſo the conſtitutions of theſe mens Sermons do alter and change; one while we find them all for moderation and Chriſtian accommodation, and forbearance one of another, another while all for Reformation again, that is, Presbytery in the rigid ſence thereof, that is, that all power may be in the Miniſters hands, and the Magiſtrates engaged to put their Orders, and Edicts, wills and pleaſures into execution; one while pleading for and preſſing the ſetting up the Government of Chriſt in the hearts of men, minding them to be zealous for the great things of the Goſpel, Faith, Repentance, and love among Brethren, and not to contend ſo ſtrenuouſly for the Mint and Cummin, Diſcipline and Government,* &c. *Anotherwhile calling with might and main for Reformation, Reformation, putting the Crown upon the Head of Chriſt, and the Scepter into his hand, pleading for the Government of Jeſus Chriſt, that is, the exalting themſelves above their Brethren;* and yet *theſe are the men ſo fixt and conſtant as none more.* The truth is, theſe and other Teſtimonies which might be produced, do abundantly evince that Presbyterian Principles alter according to the variation of the Presbyterian Intereſt. And that the ſame Principles which men of that temper exclaim againſt and condemn, when made uſe of to the prejudice of their Party, or in defence of Prelatical Government, have notwithſtanding been approved of, and reduced into practice by them, when the doing ſo tended

to

to the promotion and advancement of their Intereſt. Biſhop *Bancroft* hath long ſince manifeſted to the world by the ſeveral inſtances produced in his *Survey of the pretended Holy Diſcipline, c.* 26. *There is nothing,* ſays he, *more uſually objected againſt the* preſent State, Superiority and Authority of Biſhops, *than that of S.* Peter, 1. Pet. 5. *Not as though you were Lords over the Clergy. And* Luk. 22. 26. *But you ſhall not be ſo. And 'twill not be admitted in any wiſe that we ſhould expound thoſe places of ambitious affectation, of Tyrannous practice, or of the abuſe of ſuch ſuperiority, or Juriſdiction: But if you will ſpeak of* the Right, Authority, and Juriſdiction of their Elderſhips, *the caſe is altered. There are ſome as it ſeemeth beyond the Seas, who ſeeing the Pride of the Conſiſtorian Government do affirm that the Power of the Church is only Spiritual, and not any External Exerciſe, Practice, and right of any Authority, Power and Government: With this oppoſition ſo much derogating from the dignity of their Elderſhips,* Danæus *is moved and anſwering that conceit, ſaith, that although the power of the Church* ad animarum ſalutem ſit comparata, *be inſtituted for the health of Souls, yet notwithſtanding it hath neceſſarily annext unto it, an indiſſoluble band, an external exerciſe, practice and uſe,* Juris & Gubernationis, *of Law and Government,* De Poteſt. Eccleſ. c. 3. *Againſt this anſwer reply as it ſeemeth is made with the ſame places mentioned that are urged againſt our Biſhops; whereupon* Danæus *to make all things*

clear,

clear, adds theſe words to his former Anſwer and publiſhes the ſame from Geneva [*whereas it may be objected out of Peter,* Not bearing Rule, &c. *'Tis eaſily anſwered,* Damnatur enim partim abuſus, non uſus illius poteſtatis; partim illius cum civili confuſio; *for partly the abuſe is condemned, not the uſe of that power, and partly the confounding of it with the civil power.*] *Which is the very anſwer that we make and approve (being extorted from them by Gods good providence) for the ſtopping of our mens mouths, who upon pretence of thoſe places, have opened them ſo wide againſt the lawful authority of our Biſhops.* Another example of the like nature we have in the ſame Chapter: *It is a thing too manifeſt,* ſaith he, *with what libelling and railing the Form of our Service, of our Ceremonies, of our Ornaments, of our Apparel,* &c. *hath been depraved and ſhamefully ſlandered; as that our Communion Book was culled out of the Popes Portuiſe —— this was abuſed in Popery —— that is papiſtical. —— Whatſoever cometh from the Pope comes firſt from the Devil. —— If of the Eggs of a Cockatrice can be made wholſome meat to feed with —— then may alſo the things that come from the Pope and the Devil be good, profitable and neceſſary to the Church. Againſt theſe ſpeeches anſwer hath been made, that 'tis lawful to try all things and to hold faſt that which is good; that we muſt diſtinguiſh between the abuſe of a thing and its lawful uſe. —— that as good men ſometimes deviſe that which is Evil, ſo Evil men may ſometimes deviſe that*

which is profitable: But all theſe anſwers are miſliked, denied and condemned by theſe our Factioners. Howbeit upon occaſion the ſtream is turned, and they themſelves are driven to make the very ſame Anſwers for the juſtifying of their own proceedings, and for the maintenance of certain particular matters which they do urge and allow of. It hath been laid to their charge, that for all their goodly pretences of Reformation, yet indeed the courſe they held did ſmell moſt rankly of Anabaptiſm, Donatiſm, and of a new kind of Papiſm; as where they diſquiet the peace of the Churches already reformed, rail upon our Miniſters and their Calling, affirm that our Sacraments are not ſincerely miniſtred; that there is no Church as it ſhould be but thoſe that they like of; that our Ceremonies and Orders are all unlawful; that we have no lawful Miniſters or Biſhops; — that Princes may not deal in cauſes Eccleſiaſtical, &c. Theſe and many ſuch like points being laid to their charge, Cartwright (*as though he had never dream'd of any thing to the contrary*) *frames this general anſwer in the name of all his fraternity.* (T. C. B. 2. Ep.) *If among the filth of their Hereſies* (viz. *of Papiſts, Anabaptiſts, and Donatiſts,*) *there may be found any good thing* (*as it were a grain of good Corn in a great deal of darnel*) *that we willingly receive not as theirs, but as the Jews did the holy Ark from the Philiſtines, whereof they were unjuſt owners: For herein 'tis true that is ſaid, the Sheep muſt not lay down her fell, becauſe ſhe ſees the Wolf ſometimes clothed with it; yea it may come*

to pass that the Synagogue of Satan may have some one thing at some time with more convenience than the true and Catholick Church of Christ: Such was the Ceremony of pouring Water once only upon the Child in Baptism used with us and in the most reformed Churches, which in some Ages was used by those of the Eunomian Heresy.] Much more of the same strain is legible in that chapter touching the mutability of *the ancient Presbyterians*, when the changing of their Opinions would render their Interest more considerable. And is there no example think you, to be met with of the like mutability in *our Modern Presbyterians?* Judge by what follows whether they have not contradicted their own Principles, yea and those of their Presbyterian Ancestors. For the proof of the latter, I refer the Reader to a little Book called, [*Beams of former Light*] written (by Mr. *Nye* as 'tis reported) on occasion of that Ordinance made by the Secluded Members at their Re-admission into the House of Commons (1660.) imposing on all Ministers the Assemblie's lesser Catechism under the penalty of their being ejected as scandalous *p.* 101. if they neglected to use it though but 10 Sundays in a year (unless on a cause approved of by two Justices) against which impositions those Beams of Light, (discovering how evil 'tis to impose doubtful and disputable Forms on Ministers under penalty of Ejection) were darted. In which Book the Author heaps up the Arguments of the *old Presbyterian Nonconformists* against *the new ones*, and

that injunction of theirs, and endeavours to manifest it *more harsh and severe than the former Episcopal Impositions* (*p.* 104, 105. 77.) *and yet that there was more reason and necessity for those than this*, *p.* 107. he throngs together the same Scripture-proofs against this, that were formerly urged against those, and speaks as superstitiously against a Catechism-Book, *p.* 37, 38. as the men of the Presbyterian strain were wont to speak against a Prayer-Book, and an Homily-Book. From which discourse it appears that those men did for the advancement of their Interest contradict the Principles [*of their Nonconforming predecessors.*] And that they have upon the same score contradicted *their own Principles*, I shall evidence partly from this *John Corbet*'s affirmations concerning them, partly from their late Book called [*The Covenanters Plea against Absolvers.*] In which last piece I observe that though they did not well understand, *p.* 6. what good thing can be assigned which falls under no divine Precept, (and consequently they did not understand how any good thing can be indifferent and uncommanded) yet *p.* 10. they grant *that the matter of a Promise, Vow, Oath or Covenant, may be something (not necessary or previously required of us by some divine Law, but) free and indifferent, not determined by the divine Law*; And *that rational and religious Acts* (for such they affirm Oaths, Vows and Covenants to be (Ch. 2. Sect. 3. — Ch. 3. *p.* 11.) yea sacred Invocations of the name of God, pieces of divine

Worship,

Worship, Ch. 2. Sect. 3. p. 5. and p. 6. S. 3.) *may be exercised about matters left indifferent* (not enjoyned by the Divine Law:) and moreover that *by an Oath* (*imposed by a Lawful Magistrate*) *that which before was free and indifferent, is made necessary to the takers*, p. 65. *S.* 19. *and that the obligation of an Oath thus imposed results from Divine Institution*, p. 62. S. 11. *from God's Law*, p. 64. Sect. 13. By which Concessions they do not only condemn all those Nonconformists, who refused compliance with Episcopal Impositions, because (forsooth) their Christian Liberty in things left indifferent by God, ought not to be prejudiced and restrained by man; but also they overthrow, 1. that principle, *That nothing is a duty, especially in Gods worship, which is not commanded by God*; and 2. that principle, that *no part of worship is lawful which is not commanded of God*; and yet both these principles are owned by Presbyterians, if this Author deceive us not, p. 88. 98. where he tells us they hold, that *Scripture only is the Rule of instituted worship, wherein both addition and diminution is alike forbidden*; and p. 84, 85. that *whatsoever instituted worship is not ordained of God is unlawful*; whence it follows, that men ought not to swear or Covenant for or against any thing that's left indifferent in the Divine Law; not for any thing which God's word commands not, nor against any thing which it does not forbid. For so to do is to worship God, by taking such an Oath, and entring into

such a Covenant as is not ordained by him, but is only of humane Institution and determination. Now the Solemn League and Covenant was not either instituted or imposed by God in his Law, either of Nature or Scripture, (even by their own confession, who on Saturday *Aug.* 5. 1648. affirmed in the House of Commons, that the Covenant it self was not *jure Divino*, though the keeping of it being taken was, *Hist. of Independ.* 1 *Part p.* 125. 126.) but only by men; and 'tis acknowledged by those pleaders to have been a Vow only (freely and voluntarily entred into, and not by vertue of any Divine command) in the first takers and imposers; and therefore (since 'tis owned also as a sacred, religious Act of worship) 'twas in them and others, not only a piece of Schism against the Church of *England*, and of Sedition against the King and Laws of *England*, but also a solemn piece of superstition & will-worship (as that signifies, in their own dialect, a worshipping God in such a manner as himself hath not prescribed in his Word,) and therefore (on the score of Presbyterian principles) an Act of high and hainous disobedience to the Law of God; and therefore their taking an Oath thus imposed, was to violate their principles for the advancement of their Interest: and yet these are the men that are so fixt and constant as none more. Besides, this Author tells us, *p.* 85. that *Presbyterians hold, that that Ceremony which is instituted by men,* (not by God) *which is of mystical signification,* and (though it may naturally, yet) *does*

not

not actually signifie without humane institution, and is by men appropriate to Divine worship, is (*upon that account*) *a part of Divine worship*: and p. 88. 98. they hold, that *all such sacred Ceremonies* (*not commanded by God*) *are neither good nor lawful.* But say I, this was the very case in the taking of the Covenant; for the Ceremony with which the Covenanters did take it, *viz.* lifting up the hand, was *appropriate to that Oath*, (which they deemed a piece of religious worship.) It did *not actually signifie* that the Takers did swear, either by Divine, or Natural, but by Humane Institution, and that novel too: the usual Ceremony of taking an Oath in this Nation, (before) being *tactis sacrosanctis Christi Evangeliis*, laying the hand upon, and afterwards kissing the holy Evangels; to which indeed that Covenant was so contrary, that 'tis no wonder the Ceremony was altered and exchanged for that of lifting up the hand, which is not of Divine Institution, or prescribed by God the Father in the Old Testament, and much less by God the Son in the New, whom yet Presbyterians hold *to be the only Master of ordaining Ceremonies for the Christian Worship*; and some of them, it seems, are *yet to learn, that any examples oblige them, but those of Christ and his Apostles*, (and consequently no Old Testament examples,) Discourse of Liturgies, *p.* 60. And that that Ceremony was of mystical signification I prove by that *medium* which this Author himself makes use of, *p.* 87. 97. to prove the Cross in Baptism such a Ceremony, *viz. It is used as a*

sealing sign of our obligation to Christ, and therefore it's in that respect Sacramental: so say I was the lifting up of the hand (in the swearing the Covenant) used as a sealing sign of the Covenanters obligation to God and Christ --- Although indeed and in truth by that Covenant sealed with that Ceremony they dedicated themselves to the disservice of him that died on the Cross, to a real and practical defiance of Christ the King of his Church, and his Vicegerent in this Nation, King *Charles*. Thus a Ceremony of humane (Presbyterian) institution for the ratification of a seditious Covenant, ordained and imposed against Law by an illegal power, for the satisfying of the *Scotch* appetite, and promoting the Presbyterian Interest, is a Camel easily and greedily swallowed by the capacious throat of a Presbyterian Covenanter, who yet at the same time can either blindly or perversly strain at the Gnat of a Ceremony instituted by lawful Authority, establisht and enjoyned by the Laws of the Land and Constitutions of the Church. If I had some Books about me (fit for such a purpose) I believe I could add some sheets of pertinent instances (to Bishop *Bancroft*'s Collection in that 26. *ch.* of his Survey) of Presbyterian Levity in opinion, and inconsistency with themselves, and with others of their own Faction, when self-interest prompted them to such variations. I shall at this time mention only one proof more. 'Tis a repeated principle of the Covenanters in their Plea, and their discourse of Liturgies, that *neither*

ther the Parliament nor any power under Heaven, can diſcharge them from the obligation of an Oath. This is good Doctrine it ſeems, when applied to the Covenant, and underſtood in a ſence advantageous to Presbytery: but when the Queſtion was about the obligation of the Oath of Allegiance (wherein they ſwore, that they would defend his Majeſty, his Heirs and Succeſſors, to the uttermoſt of their power, againſt all conſpiracies and attempts whatſoever, which ſhould be made againſt his or their perſons, Crown and Dignity, by reaſon or colour of any Sentence or Declaration of the Pope, [*or otherwiſe*,] and that they are in conſcience reſolved, that neither the Pope nor any perſon whatſoever hath power to abſolve them of that Oath, or any part of it;) I ſay, when this was the Queſtion, then Presbyterian practiſes manifeſted, that they accounted the contrary good Doctrine, *viz.* that thoſe two Houſes (who were far enough from either deſerving or being capable of the Title of the Parliament of *England*) might diſcharge men from the obligation of this Oath; for they impoſed the Negative Oath, and made men ſwear, that they would not directly or indirectly adhere to, or willingly aſſiſt the King in his War againſt the Forces of the two Houſes; which Negative Oath being contrary to that of Allegiance, could not with any colour of reaſon or conſcience be impoſed or taken, unleſs the impoſers and takers were perſwaded of the truth of that principle, *viz.* that the Presbyterian Lords and Commons

had

had authority to diſcharge men from the obligation of that Oath; and yet theſe are the men that are ſo fixt and conſtant as none more: and ſo ſetled in their principles, that a Prince or State may know where to find them; words that, for ought I ſee, have no Truth in them at all, unleſs underſtood in this ſence, that a Prince may be ſure to find Presbyterians conſtant *to their ſelf-Intereſt*, though not *to their Principles*, and fixt and diligent in deſigning methods, and carrying on contrivances in oppoſition to legal eſtabliſhments, for the thruſting up Presbytery into the Throne, and the forcing of Majeſty and Prelacy to embrace a Dunghil.

It follows, *p.* 57. 67. [*They do not ſtrain ſo high, but they conſider withal, what the Kingdoms of the world will bear, and are willing to bring things to the capacity of Political Government.*] I ſuppoſe the mans meaning is this: That Presbyterians are ſomewhat cautious and circumſpect for their own ſafety. They'l venture *their Ears* before they hazard *their Necks*; and contenting themſelves with deſerving *a Dungeon* only at firſt, will take heed of meriting *the Gallows*, till they are able to ſafeguard themſelves from the *ſword of Juſtice* by unſheathing *that of Rebellion*. They'l conſider whether the Kings of the world have indeed the power of their (reſpective) Nations in their hands or no; and whether (if they have it) 'tis probable they will bear the ſword in vain, or execute vengeance with it on them that do evil: In order whereunto they'l feel their way,

it

it may be, ſtep by ſtep, firſt by talking ſeditiouſly in private Conventicles; then by railing and reviling Loyal ſubjects in the Pulpit; then by ſlandering inferiour Governours, and rendring them contemptible and odious unto the people; and afterwards by raiſing jealouſies and envious malicious paſſions in mens minds againſt the Supreme: and if he let the ſword of Juſtice ruſt in the ſcabbard, till by the predominancy of a tumultuous rabble, aided and abetted by ſome ſeditious, malignant ſpirits among the Nobility and Gentry, he's diſenabled from drawing it, either at all, or to any purpoſe; then thoſe pawns and Rooks' will ſtrain ſo high, as to give checkmate to Majeſty, and demonſtrate to the world how imprudently thoſe Pearls of Royal patience, lenity, and condeſcenſion were caſt before ſuch Swine, whoſe brutiſh temper inclines them to turn upon and rent their Benefactors; like traiterous *Judas's*, to reward them evil for good, and hatred for their good will. [Mr. *Martin* (ſays the Hiſt. of Independ. *p.* 97.) *was expelled the Houſe for words ſpoken againſt the King — becauſe ſpoken unſeaſonably, when the King was in good ſtrength; and the words, whether true or falſe, were, in ſtrictneſs of Law, Treaſon; leſt the whole Houſe might be drawn within compaſs of High Treaſon for conniving at them — but afterward the King growing weaker, and the Parliament ſtronger; the Houſe reſtored Mr.* Martin, *and thought fit to ſet every mans Tongue at liberty.*] It ſeems the Political Government was then brought

brought *to a capacity of bearing such crimes.* Bishop *Bancroft* in his Book of Dangerous Positions, *p.* 98. tells us of a Book of Discipline subscribed to by some Presbyterian Brethren in those days, which they promised, as God should offer opportunity, and give them to discern it so expedient, by humble suit to her Majestie's honourable Council and the Parliament, and by all other lawful and convenient means to further and advance, so far as the Laws, and peace, and the present state of the Church would suffer it, and not enforce to the contrary. One Mr. *Littleton* being examined upon his Oath, what the last words should mean, answered, That he himself, Mr. *Snape*, Mr. *Proudloe* and others, did agree to put that Discipline in execution and practice, *so far as the peace and the present state of the Church would suffer, and not enforce to the contrary, that is, till the Magistrate did enjoyn them or enforce them to leave the practice of the said Discipline* —— *Now*, says the Bishop, *what if by the secret practices (to draw away the peoples hearts from the present Government of the Church) they could have procured such strength and number to have followed them, as that no reasonable restraint or force of the Magistrate had been able to have encountered and suppressed them? I do but ask the Question*, says he, *p.* 101. and I answer it thus: If they had been of the same Rebellious humour with our modern Presbyterians, they would, when they had brought things to that pass, have appeared in Arms, and raised a bloudy War,

and

and by force have set up their holy Discipline, and strained so high in contradiction to all legal Authority, as to have subverted the constitution of our English Monarchy, and turned our Government in Church and State Topsi-turvy.

He goes on: [*They can have no pleasure in commotions, for Order and regular Unity is their Way, and therefore stability of Government and publick Tranquillity is their Interest:*] Which has something of Truth in it, if understood of Presbyterians, when they are got into the Saddle themselves, and are well setled in an usurp'd Dominion, but till then (for ought I see) they take as much pleasure in commotions and alterations as Jesuits do, and will disturb the publick Tranquillity, and subvert all legal Order and regular Unity, rather than suffer their own Interest to be rejected and depressed; witness their late Wars, and their Solemn League and Covenant, and a series of other actions, whose direct tendency was to the destruction of our English Polity, both Ecclesiastical and Civil, as is before manifested.

[*It's most unreasonable*, says he, *to object that the late wild postures, extravagancies, and incongruities in Government were the work of Presbytery or Presbyterians*; his reason is, *because the Nation had never proof of Presbytery, for 'twas never settled.*]

A. If it should be granted that the Nation had never proof of Presbytery, what's this to

presbyte-

Presbyterians (whom the objection speaks of as well as Presbytery?) Had the Nation never any proof of such kind of Creatures? nay had we not such proof of them for several years together, as we have great reason to lament even to this day? And I much fear that the fatal Influence of those wild postures and extravagancies which Presbyterians, (such persons as himself described, *p.* 20. 30. by their main and rooted Principles) were the Authors of, is not yet exhausted; but will work us more mischief, and be very prejudicial to those initials of Order and Tranquillity, which at present we (through mercy) enjoy. The words of our late Soveraign quoted *p.* 58. 68. are no proof of that which this Author asserts and would prove by them, *viz.* that *Presbytery was decried and exposed to prejudice by those that were in sway* [*in the more early times of the late Wars*] for those words speak rather of *the conclusion of the Wars*; for 'twas then and not in the more early times that [*Military success discovered to several Factions their particular advantages and invited them to part stakes*;] but they are a considerable proof that 'tis no such unreasonable thing (as this Author pretends) to object that the late wild postures and extravagances were the work of Presbytery: For they inform us that [Presbytery was the great Master of the lesser Factions, Independents, Anabaptists, *&c.*] Which Factions were so well disciplin'd and documentized by that Arch-Faction, that (being some of them

also

also men of quick apprehensions) they speedily and throughly learnt the Presbyterian Arts of dividing and dissipating; yea those Factious Scholars made such zealous, diligent, and sagacious Improvements of those Factious Principles which the great Presbyterian Faction had inculcated into them both by Doctrine and Practice, that they became two-fold more the children of Hell than their Teachers, and so extravagant and unruly at last as to whip their great Master out of that seditious and Tyrannical School with Rods of his own making, and to rout Presbytery in the strength of those very Principles by which [Presbyterians] had before routed Prelacy first and then Majesty.

[*Neither*, says he, *can Sects or Schisms with any Truth or Justice be reckoned the Off-spring of Presbytery*] If he mean by Presbytery [exact Presbytery] (*p.* 44. 54.) and that Scotch Form of Ecclesiastical Polity (59. 69.) where there is no presiding Bishop, he contradicts Father *Hierome*, who (though Presbyterians account him their great Friend) testifies in several places, that Episcopacy was instituted (*unus cæteris præpositus* —— *superpositus* ——) for the preventing of those Schisms which were begotten by Presbytery: *In Schismatis remedium factum est, nè unusquisque ad se trahens Christi Ecclesiam rumperit*, (Ep. ad Evagrium.) *ut Schismatum semina tollerentur.* ——and those *Studia in Religione* which happened when the Churches were governed *communi Presbyterorum consilio*, (in Ep.

Ep. ad Titum. c. 1.) *ut dissentionum plantaria evellerentur* (ibid.) Nay in his Dialogue against the Luciferians, he tells us that *Ecclesiæ salus in summi Sacerdotis dignitate pendet; cui si non exors quædam & ab omnibus eminens detur potestas, tot in Ecclesiis efficientur Schismata quot Sacerdotes.* The welfare of the Church depends upon the dignity of the chief Priest, to whom if some extraordinary and supereminent power be not granted, there will be as many Schisms in the Churches as Priests: Yea he contradicts Mr. *Calvin* who acknowledges also that Episcopacy was agreed upon, *Nè ex æqualitate ut fieri solet, dissidia nascerentur*, lest equality among Ministers should, as 'tis wont to do, produce division. I may conclude therefore with a late writer; that *if any Presbyterian Churches do keep themselves entire from the Gangrene of Sects and Schisms, that Unity springs from some other Fountain and is the effect of some collateral cause which has Antidote enough in it to preserve those Churches from the venemous contagion of* [*Exact Presbytery.*]

[*A wide breach* (if he speak truth) *was once made in the* Netherlands *by* Arminius *and his followers, but after some years conflict 'twas healed by the Synod of* Dort.] I discern not why this Author should produce this instance to prove that Schisms cannot truly or justly be reckoned the off-spring *of Presbytery*, unless 'twere because he was either ignorant or had forgot that the men who, as he says, made that breach (*viz. Arminius*

and

and his Followers) *were Presbyterians* (*as vehement and resolute maintainers of the Ministerial parity, as any that concluded or accepted the Judgment of that Synod*) say the Brittish Divines there present in their [*Joint attestation*, &c.] men that though they were not so presumptuous as to condemn our English Hierarchy as unlawful, or so contentious as to fancy with our Puritans, Brownists and others, that they ought to divide and separate themselves from our Church because governed by Prelacy (if so be Prelates did not degenerate into Tyrants) yet they (not only deny that the superiority of one Minister above another is by divine right, but also) seem unwilling that that form of Government should be introduced into the *Netherlands*; and yet they produce a pregnant Testimony from Bishop *Carleton*'s book against Bishop *Mountague*'s Appeal, that the chief of their Belgick adversaries at that Synod were desirous of enjoying a Form of Church-Government modelled according to the English pattern: And when that Bishop of *Chichester* had openly in that Synod declared against that parity of Ministers spoken of in the *Belgick-Dort* confession as instituted by Christ, and manifested that imparity among Ministers, and superiority was ordained by our Saviour, and challenged any there present to prove the contrary, he was answered only with silence: And when afterwards he did in private conference

See their Exam. Censure Leyd. Fol. 232.

with several of the best learned in that Synod maintain, that the cause of all their troubles was the want of Bishops, by whose Authority turbulent and contentious Novelists might be checked, censured and suppressed; they did not deny it, but answered that they did very much revere and honour the good Order and Discipline of the Church of *England*, and would heartily and gladly receive the same into their own Churches if the state of Affairs among them would permit it; but that could not be expected, and therefore they hoped that God would be merciful to them if they did what they could, since they could not do what they would: Which answer of theirs the Bishop lookt on as a sufficient Apology, in that they did not openly defend that Anarchy and popular confusion which Presbyterian parity tends to.

Well, it seems *that wide breach was after some years conflict* [*healed*] *by the Synod of* Dort.

Set cases if this Rector had a wide breach made in his body, and if his Physicians should in order to his cure handle him in such an inhumane and imperious manner as those Synodists treated the Remonstrants, (yea and some moderate men of their own Party) he would be loth to call it [*Healing*.] His most virulent enemy could not easily wish him a greater torment on earth than to have a *Bogerman* for his Doctor, a *Sibrandus* or *Gomarus* for his Chirurgion. Let him read the *brief account of the Synod of* Dort, annext by

Tilenus

Tilenus to his [*Result of false Principles*] (lately publisht) or those letters from Mr. *Hales* and Mr. *Balcanqual* out of which 'tis extracted, or the *Acta & Scripta Synodalia Remonstrantium*; and then tells us how he likes those methods of Cure, or (if he thinks these too partial Relators) let him peruse the *Acta Synodalia contra-Remonstrantium* with an attentive and impartial spirit, and if that Book does not sufficiently prejudice him against those Physicians, 'twill not have so good an influence upon him as to my knowledge it has had upon one who was no friend to Arminian Tenents. Though some moderate men were against the Remonstrants in all five Articles in substance, yet if they differed but in manner of speaking from the rigid Synodists (who were the major part) they would not hold him sound; Does he call this *Healing*? There was a plot laid *ex composito* by the fierce Party for the disgracing of the *Breme* Divines who were more temperate, and the *British* Divines drew the indignation of the Provincials upon themselves, by sweetly interposing to allay their contentions, Does he call this *Healing*? When the Remonstrants seemed to yield, the forrein Divines could not be heard for the continuing them in the Synod; their voices indeed were ask'd hoping they would have been answerable to the Provincials design, but finding it was otherwise, without so much as laying their heads together for consultation, they publisht a Decree of dismission which was written before they

came into the Synod; (*The trick was a little too palpable*, says Mr. *Balcanqual*) Does he call this *Healing?* The Canons were drawn up in private, and as 'twere dictated by the President, just as those of the Council of *Trent* are said to have been by the Pope, (which occasioned that reflection, that the Holy Ghost (to whose aids the *Tridentine* Synodists pretended so much in their Decrees) was sent from *Rome* to *Trent* in a Portmantue;) Does he call this *Healing?* And says Mr. *Balcanqual*, *they would have their Canons so full charged with Catechetical Speculations as they will be ready to burst.* —— *and methinks 'tis hard that every man should be deposed from his Ministry who will not hold every particular Canon; never did any Church of old, nor any Reformed Church propose so many Articles to be held* sub pœna excommunicationis; Does he call this *Healing?* If the present Convocation at *Westminster* should apply such remedies to the wounds and breaches made by Presbyterians in Church-affairs, I doubt he would not call it *an healing Synod.* But since he seems to approve and take pleasure in the exercise of such severities as degradation, sequestration, excommunication, &c. towards these that could not in conscience subscribe to the dictates of that Synod; I wish him and his Party so much happiness as to be treated with the like severity by our Governours, Civil, and Ecclesiastical, in case they will not subscribe to the Articles and Canons of the Church of *England*, that so after many Conflicts those

wide

wide breaches which these *State-Arminians* have made among us may be *healed*, and which in all probability had never proceeded to that degree of malignity, if such gangren'd members had been cut off according to Canon, depriv'd of the profits of their Benefices, and the privilege of Church-Communion. I wish also that our English Bishops may make them & others feel the smart of that method of Discipline, which (it seems) is very effectual to prevent the broaching of error, *viz.* censuring every aberration in Doctrine and practice; imposing silence upon Ministers as to doubtful and disputed opinions, till a Synod shall determine; which censures and impositions, if impugned and disobeyed, I presume are back'd with the Excommunication of such refractory persons. These courses are esteemed good and laudable in *Dutchland* and *Scotland*, and may be called *Healing*, when made use of by Presbyterians: but if our Bishops and their Presbyters should deal thus with the disobedient Presbyterians here in *England*, Excommunication would be called *persecution*, and the imposing of Canonical subscription *a yoke of bondage*, an *unreasonable thing*, and what not? Witness this Authors language and discourse in this very Book, where (forgetting what 'twas he had called *Healing* in this *p.*) he affirms, *p.* 94, 95. (104, 105.) that *Canonical subscription lately imposed is a yoke of Bondage*, which he supposes to be removed by the Kings Declaration, and therefore (though his Brethren in their Discourse of Liturgies, *p.* 60. ingenuously

confeſs, that *that Declaration cannot diſſolve the obligation of a Law,*) would not have that yoke laid on mens necks any more; ſince 'tis in his opinion *both unneceſſary, unprofitable, and unreaſonable*; which laſt he proves againſt Prelatiſts by as weak an Argument as *White* (as 'tis ſuſpected) brings, in the latter end of *Rushworth*'s firſt Dialogue, to prove (againſt proteſtants in general) that 'tis unreaſonable for them to hold any point certainly true, and conſequently to require any ſubſcription to Articles, *viz. becauſe they profeſs themſelves fallible*; as if they who confeſs they might have been deceived, may not yet be confident (upon good grounds) that they are not actually deceived; and upon that account require ſubſcription to them. The other two he proves alſo by ſuch Arguments as will render all Synods, Presbyterian as well as Epiſcopal, uſeleſs things; and which will prove the *Dutch*, *French* or *Scotch* impoſition of Articles, and Canons as unneceſſary, unprofitable, and unreaſonable as the *Engliſh*; and yet Biſhop *Bancroft* aſſures us in his Survey, *p.* 311. that *if the beſt and the learneſt man in Chriſtendom were in* Geneva, *and ſhould oppoſe himſelf to any thing that the Church there holdeth, if he eſcaped with his life he might thank God, but he ſhould be ſure not to continue a Miniſter there --- No man ſhall ever perſwade me*, ſays the Biſhop, *but that the word of God doth give as free liberty to the Church of* England *for the repreſſing of ſuch Schiſmaticks, as either to* Geneva *or any Church whatſoever*: Thus he.

be. And if Prelatists had been as diligent and severe in enquiring out, and punishing dissenters from the publickly receiv'd Doctrine, and oppugners of the Laws of our Church, a greater unity might have been procured, and our sad divisions and breaches, in all likelihood, prevented: I mean, on supposition that the Civil Magistrates had in their several places respectively, firmly adhered to the Ecclesiastical, and prosecuted their Canonical Censures, if contemn'd, with the addition of Civil penalties upon the refractory and contumacious: without which 'tis not probable that the *Dort* Assembly would have prov'd an [Healing Synod,] nor the *Scotch* Discipline a sufficient preservative against Sects and Schisms: which I am apt enough to believe severity will suppress, though exercised by Presbyteries, if the Civil Governours act their part in abetting and promoting the just severity of Ecclesiasticks.

[*Whence therefore*, says he, p. 60. *should this charge of Presbyteriet begetting Sects and Schisms arise? Peradventure some Presbyterians have turned Sectaries. Surely it would be taken for a weak arguing, to say that Prelacy is the way to Popery, because some Prelatists have turned Papists.*]

A. I acknowledge that arguing weak; but what if they that make the objection be found to frame their Argument (in reference to our modern Presbyterians) in this manner? Multitudes that embraced those Principles, which Presbyte-

rians owned in the days of their calamity and depression, turned Sectaries and Schismaticks afterward, and yet still retained those Principles, and by rational deductions pleaded them, in order to the justification of their Schism; therefore those principles do in their own nature produce Sects and Schisms. If the case be indeed thus, the objection is strong; and for the proof of the Argument and Antecedent, I'le undertake, if this Author shall deny either, or evince that the like objection may, upon the like ground, be urged against the English Prelacy. In the mean time we'le content our selves with the affirmation of *Charles* the First, that *Presbytery was (in the late times) the great Master of lesser Factions in Religion.*

The truth is, says this *J. C. Sectarianism* (both Presbyterian and Independent, say I) *grew up in a Mystery of Iniquity* (good, for twas by opposing and exalting it self above all that was called God in this Nation) *and State-policy,* (good again; claw me and I'le claw thee, was the politick Dialect of Presbyterians at first towards Independents,) *and it was not well discerned* (by the Presbyterians, whom interest and reason of State perswaded to shut their eyes and wink at the Independents, Anabaptists, and other Sectaries,) *till it became almost triumphant by Military successes; but after that its growth did manifestly appear* (prejudicial to Presbyterian ambition) *Presbytery began to struggle with it,* (to frown upon and oppose those whom it before

counte-

countenanced and caressed,) and *so continued, until by the power of the Army it was enforced to sit down, but never to comply,* (unless 'twere by taking the Engagement at last,) *whereupon the Tongues and Pens of Sectaries were employed against none more than Presbyterians,* (*viz.* because they thought the Prelatists more conscientious adherers to Prelatical Principles than Presbyterians were to their dividing and dissipating maxims.) *And I should be glad to hear of such bitter Invectives of the Papists against the Prelatists.* It seems the man hath neither seen nor heard of *S. W's.* Scripts against the Right Reverend Bishop *Bramhall*, and the Reverend Dr. *Hammond*, or else he does not judge them bitter Invectives: but it had been too palpable hypocrisie (as well as a piece of high Ingratitude) for *Jesuits* to have inveighed bitterly against our *modern Presbyterians*, who were so zealously imployed for several years together about Jesuitical work, and who had so industriously acted the Powder-Traitors part, that they very effectually blew up both King and Parliament: and at the Isle of *Wight*-Treaty were very busie in destroying Kingly power, and in accomplishing the design of *Campanella* and other Papists, *viz.* of changing our Monarchical Government into a Commonwealth-Form, by placing all the considerable Authority and Prerogative, which before belonged to our Kings, in some Lords Temporal and Commons,

[*And*

[*And verily there's no greater bar against Fanaticism, than the right Presbyterian principles, as* 1. *not to sever but joyn the written Word and Spirit for direction.* 2. *The Spirit and use of Ordinances for edification.* 3. *To erect a Stated Church-Order and Discipline.* 4. *To allow to the Church a directive, and to every Christian a discretive judgment.* 5. *To insist only upon Divine Scripture-warrant, and to wave humane Authority in matters of Religion.*] To which I answer briefly, That the four first of these (as he hath worded them in very general terms) are as much Prelatical as Presbyterian; nay, they are owned by Independents and Anabaptists as well as Presbyterians; and therefore if these Sects are Fanaticks, there must be some greater bar against Fanaticism than those Principles. But the Fifth [*To insist only on Divine Scripture-warrant, and to wave humane Authority in matters of Religion*] is so loosely and crudely delivered, that 'tis rather the main Original of all Fanaticism than a bar against it; forasmuch as the Religion of the most sober Independents and Anabaptists, as also of Enthusiasts and Quakers, is founded upon this principle, all of them waving humane Authority, and insisting only on Scripture-dictates, and that Divine warrant which thence they plead for their modes, forms and opinions, for their walking according to the light connate with them, springing up within them, or darted into them from above.

[*But of all the prejudices and scandals* (says this Author, *p.* 63. 73.) *taken against this way,* (Presbytery) *there's none greater than this, that 'tis represented as Tyrannical and domineering, and that those that live under it, must, like* Issachar, *crouch under the burden.*]

A. It seems he thinks Tyrannical domineering over Inferiors to be a greater crime than disobedience and rebellion against Superiors, or else he would have accounted their being represented *as Rebels*, a greater prejudice against Presbyterians, than their being represented as *domineering persons*: but he Apologizes for them, by retorting the charge on Prelatists, and telling us, that *Presbytery is not more severe in censuring the breach of God's Commandments, than the Hierarchy in censuring the breach of their own Constitutions*, which passage looks as if the man had a mind to insinuate, that Presbyterian severity is exercised only on the Transgressors of God's Commands, and Hierarchical severity only on the offenders against Episcopal Constitutions. Whether he had such an ugly meaning in those words or no, I am not certain, though to him that considers the egregious partiality of this discourse hitherto in favour of Presbyterians, 'twill be very probable he had. If he had (leaving him to prove the truth of them as to the Hierarchy,) I shall by and by make bold to disprove them as to Presbytery.

In the mean time we'le pass on to the next words. [*Or is the offence taken upon pretence, that*

that Presbyterians affect and arrogate an arbitrary power, would rule by Faction, and exercise a rigour to the stirring up of animosities and unquiet humours?]

A. No, the offence is not taken upon pretence, as that's contradistinct to proof, but upon sufficient evidence, that they are arrogant, factious persons, and very prone to stir up and foment unquiet humours by their disciplinarian rigour; and though the Nation generally hath not (through the mercy of Divine over-ruling providence) experimented that discipline, yet they say the *Londoners* had such proof of it in a little time, as made them quite weary of *Classical-lay-Elder-Tyranny*. If the goodness of an Almighty power had not prevented it, we may well suppose that Presbytery would have proved as imperious and domineering here in *England*, as Bishop *Bramhall* tells us, it was in *Scotland*. *Towards particular persons*, says he, (Fair warning, chap. 11.) *this Discipline is too full of rigour, like* Draco's *Laws, that were written in Blood; in lesser faults inflicting Church-censures upon slight grounds, as for an uncomely gesture, for a vain word, for suspicion of covetousness or pride, for superfluity in raiment, either for cost or fashion; for dancing at a wedding, or of servants in the streets; for wearing a man's hair* a la mode *--- for using the least recreation on the Sabbath, though void of scandal, and consistent with the duties of the Day. --- What digladiations have there been among some of their Sect about Starch and Cuffs? &c. just like those grave de-*

bates

bates which were sometimes among the Franciscans, *about the colour and fashion of their Gowns; they do not allow men a latitude of discretion in any thing. All men, even their Superiors, must be their Slaves or Pupils. It's true, they begin their censures with admonition; and if a man will confess himself a Delinquent, be sorry for giving the Presbyters any offence, and conform himself in his hair, apparel, diet, every thing, to what these rough-hewn* Cato's *shall prescribe, he may escape the Stool of Repentance, otherwise they will proceed against him for contumacy to excommunication.* By this let the Reader judge, whether Presbyterians censure *the breach of God's Commandments only*; nay, whether they are not more severe than Prelacy, in censuring *the breach of their own Constitutions.* Where has God commanded men to abstain from dancing? and yet Bishop *Bancroft* (in his Survey, *c.* 26.) informs us, that *Mr.* Calvin *hearing of that horrible sin* (*forsooth*) *committed by certain persons at Widow* Balthasar's *house in* Geneva, *procured them all, both dancers and beholders, to be called before him and his Elders in the Consistory. They denied the matter at first, whereupon* Calvin *judg'd it meet, that they should be put to their Oaths, and so compelled to confess the Truth.* (An Oath *ex officio*, it seems, is allowable at *Geneva.*) *They excepted against that way of proceeding; and one* Henriche *a Minister, who did by way of supposition* (*if any such dancing had been*) *take upon him to defend it, as not being a matter to keep such a stir about, alledg-*

ed

ed the very same place that Cartwright *did in the Consistory of S.* Paul's, *and that which all the rest of that brotherhood do commonly alledge, viz. Against an Elder receive not an accusation, but under two or three witnesses.* Calvin *laughs at this exception, and termed it a pleasant jest, and for all this, sworn they were, and so confessed the Fact, whereupon they were all cast into prison,* Henriche *was deprived of his Ministry, and one of the four Syndicks (or chief Magistrates) of the City (who had the ill luck, it seems, to be in the company) was removed from his office, till he had given some testimony of his Repentance.* Other pretty circumstances there are of this story in that Chapter, to which I refer the Reader, and return to Bishop *Bramhall*, who tells us, *That the Scotch Disciplinarians will by hook or crook bring all crimes whatever, both great and small, within their Jurisdiction: that in greater crimes, trial for life is no sufficient satisfaction to these third* Cato's, *that to satisfie their own humour they care not how they blemish publickly the reputation of the Magistrate upon frivolous conjectures. Add to this the severity and extreme rigour of their Excommunication: after which sentence no person (his Wife and Family only excepted) may have any kind of conversation with him that's Excommunicated: They may not eat, nor drink, nor buy, nor sell with him: They may not salute him, nor speak to him, except by the licence of the Presbytery: His children begotten and born after that sentence, and before his reconciliation to the Church,*

may

may not be admitted to Baptism, untill they be of Age to require it, or the Mother, or some special Friend, being a member of the Church, present the Child, abhorring and damning the iniquity and obstinate contempt of the Father.---Upon this Sentence Letters of Horning, as they use to call them in Scotland, *do follow of course; that is, an out-lawing of the Party, a confiscation of his goods, a putting him out of the Kings protection, so as any man may kill him and be unpunished.---When a man is prosecuted for his life (perhaps justly, perhaps unjustly) so as appearing and hanging are to him in effect the same thing; yet if he appear not, this pitiful Church will Excommunicate him for contumacy; as if the just and evident fear of death did not purge away contumacy.* And Chap. 12. he certifies us, *That if their Discipline be admitted in* England, *the Nobility and Gentry shall not be exempted from these rigours,---but subjected to the Censures of a raw, heady Novice, and a few ignorant Artificers.---They shall be bearded and mated by every ordinary Presbyter.---It's nothing with them for a Pedant to put himself into the balance with one of the prime and most powerful Peers of the Realm.---Parents shall lose the free disposition of their own children in marriage, if the Child desire an Husband or Wife, and the Parent refuse to consent, either for lack of goods, or if the other party is not of birth high enough.---Yea, Presbyteries will compel the wrong'd Parent to give that child as great a portion as any of his other children.---The common people shall have an high Commission*

in

in every Parish, and groan under the arbitrary Decrees of ignorant, unexperienced Governours; who know no Law but their own wills; who observe no Order but what they list; from whom lies no appeal but to a Synod, which for the shortness of its continuance can afford, which for the condition of the Persons will afford them little relief: Thus he. Whence 'tis evident enough that they who live under Scotch-Presbyterian-Discipline, (and that Discipline the English Covenanters swore to endeavour the Introduction and advancement of in this Nation; which it concerns us frequently to call to mind, that so the signal mercy manifested in blasting those endeavours may be the more magnified) must like *Issachar* crouch under a grievous burden, and either submit their Necks to such heavy yokes as imperious arrogance shall affect to lay upon them, or else resolutely shake off those yokes, by giving vent to those animosities and unquiet humours which will be stirred up in them by Presbyterian rigour: as the Scotch Shoomakers did who were most interessed in the Munday Markets at *Edenburgh*, which were upon a time abolisht by a Kirk-Enactment, but they by their tumults and threatnings compelled the Ministers to retract, whereupon it became a Jest in the City, that *the Souters could obtain more at the Ministers hands than the King.* (Fair warning, Ch. 7.)

But *there are remedies at hand,* says our Author, *to prevent the Abuse of any Government that is of it self lawful and laudable. Certainly the wisdom*

wisdom of the King and Parliament, with the advice of grave Divines, may prescribe sure and certain Rules of Discipline.] *A.* Very true, But if I am not mistaken, Presbyterians have a faculty of controlling and disobeying the most certain Rules and commands of their Governours if not suitable to their own fancies and determinations. Bishop *Bramhall* tells us in his 7. Chap. *that the Kirk in* Scotland *assume a power to abrogate and invalidate Laws and Acts of Parliament, if they seem disadvantagious to the Church. Church Assemblies* (says one of their Books of Discipline) *have power to abrogate and abolish all Statutes and Ordinances concerning Ecclesiastical matters that are found noysome and unprofitable, and agree not with the times, or are abused by the people. The Acts of Parliament* 1584. *at the very same time that they were proclaimed, were protested against at the Market Cross of* Edenburgh *by the Ministers in the name of the Kirk of* Scotland. *The general Assembly of* Glascow 1638. *impugned Episcopacy, and* Perth *Articles although ratified by Acts of Parliament and standing Laws then unrepealed.* And if Presbytery should chance to be established in *England* by a Law, what shall assure us that English Presbyterians also would not prove unruly and disobedient Subjects against both King and Parliament that shall prescribe any Rule to them in order to the preventing of their arrogant Tyranny? Not their Oaths, unless they had kept those of Supremacy, Allegiance, and Canonical

obedience better. But this Author has another remedy.

[*Moreover*, quoth he, *to cut off all occasions and prevent all appearance of domineering, all political coercive jurisdiction in matters of Religion may be withheld (if need require) from Ecclesiastical Persons, and that meer spiritual power alone* (by which he means Admonition and Excommunication) *may be left to their management.*] The man sure would perswade us that (he thinks) there can be no occasion of domineering afforded by the granting, nor appearance of it in the exercise of *power meerly spiritual*, and then there is some hopes that he is not in the number of those who imagine that the Prelates heretofore did Tyrannically abuse that power. But for all this he is unwilling that Presbyterians should have *only spiritual power* at their command, and be wholly devested of *political*, and therefore what he takes away with one hand, he gives with the other in the following words.

[*And because spiritual censures appertaining only to the Conscience may be too little regarded when no temporal damage is annext unto them, there may be a collateral, civil power always present in Ecclesiastical meetings, to take cognizance of all causes therein debated and adjudged in order to temporal penalties.*] From which words we may gather, 1. That the man is loth that all occasion of domineering should be cut off from Presbyterians, and all appearance of it prevented. 2. That he can well enough digest Prelatical power,

power, and as many Ecclesiastical Courts in a County as there are Ecclesiastical meetings, if so be Presbyterian Priests and Lay-Elders may have the management of that power and sit as Judges in those Courts; which is another indication that ambitious affections (rather than an impartial judgment) make Presbyterians exclaim so much against Prelacy; *viz.* because they are not allowed to exercise that dominion themselves which they condemn in others as Tyrannical.

[*Upon the whole matter*, says he, *aforegoing we firmly build this position, That the Presbyterian Party ought not in Justice or Reason of State to be rejected and depressed, but ought to be protected and encouraged.*]

And upon the answer to that matter contained in these Papers, I firmly build this contradictory Position, That the Presbyterian Party ought not in Justice or Reason of State to be protected and (much less) encouraged, but to be rejected and depressed; *unless they will renounce the practises and principles here objected and laid to their charge; and will disclaim that Covenant, which otherwise will engage them in such turbulent and seditious practices, as can never be justified but by such rebellious Principles.*

THE END.

A Summary
OF THE
CONTENTS.

The Question proposed,

WHether in Justice or Reason of State the Presbyterian Party should be rejected and depressed, or protected and encouraged?

The Character given of Presbyterians is considered, and manifested to be very imperfect, and deceitful, p. 4, 5, 6, &c.

Of their zeal, p. 13. *their resembling the Anabaptists in* Germany, p. 14. *their being called Fanaticks*, p. 15.

Of their varying from themselves, p. 20, 21. *their multitudes*, p. 24, 25

Of the great things for which they are said to contend, p. 26, &c.

Whether the Protestant Doctrine by Law established in the Church of England *be owned by Presbyterians*, p. 29, &c.

Of the pure spiritual heavenly doctrine which they ought to be actuated by if they expect to be encouraged, p. 33, &c.

Of Principles striking to the heart of Popery, p. 37.

Which sort of men are more pernicious in a Commonwealth, Jesuits or Presbyterians, p. 40, 41, &c.

Whether Presbyterians ought to be protected and encouraged because of their averseness from Popish Idolatries and Innovations, p. 44.

Whether they erect Imperium

perium in Imperio, p. 47, &c.

Whether their principles and Government are Anti-monarchical, p. 53, &c.

Of their unwillingness to come under any yoke but that of the Law of the Land, p. 66. *and to pay Taxes levyed without consent of Parliament*, p. 67, &c.

Of their valuing the native happiness of freeborn English Subjects, p. 69.

Whether they have any true knowledge or sense of the nature of the Christian Religion, as it refers to the question discussed, p. 71, &c.

Whether they were not guilty of rebellion in the late wars, p. 76, &c.

Whether the Fundamental Government of this Kingdom was not subverted by the Presbyterian members of the Long-Parliament, p. 95, &c.

The London-*Ministers vindication of themselves in reference to the Kings murder considered*, p. 104, &c.

The murderers of the King acted therein suitably to such principles as are owned by Presbyterian writers, p. 109, &c. *and to the fourth Article of the Covenant*, p. 114.

Of the Presbyterian Ministers exhorting men to pray that God would not permit the King to be put to death, p. 115, &c.

Whether Presbyterians disclaimed their lawful Prince, p. 120.

Whether they suffered themselves to be trodden under foot, rather than they would comply with Republicans, p. 123, &c.

Whether they were more conscientious in their duty to God and man than Prelatists, p. 130, &c.

The Plea, that Presbyterians teach obedience active in all Lawful things,

things, and passive in things unlawful enjoyned by the Higher power, considered, p. 137, &c.

Whether the restraint of profaneness, intemperance, &c. *in the late times ought to be attributed to the doctrine and orderly walking of Presbyterian Ministers*, p. 145, &c.

Of the inconstancy of Presbyterians, their inconsistency with themselves, and their unfaithfulness to their principles when their Interest tempts them to a change, p. 153, &c.

In what sense they are willing to bring things to the capacity of political Government, p. 170.

Whether Sects and Schisms may justly be reckoned the off-spring of Presbytery, p. 175.

Of the Synod of Dort, *and its healing the breach in the* Netherlands, p. 176, 177, &c.

Whether Presbytery is unjustly represented as Tyrannical and domineering. p. 187, ad fin.

The ERRATA.

PAge 3. line 29. read, *particulars*. p. 11. l. 15. r. p. 19. p. 28. l. 25. leave out *So*. p. 32. l. 26. r. *approves*. p. 35. l. 18. r. *to do your own* —. p. 55. l. 9. r. *Thrust (printed 1647.)* p. 56. l. 28. r. *check'd*. p. 78. l. 8. r. *the great Seal (and*. p. 81. l. 18. r. *de Berford*. p. 94. l. 25. r. *shall conclude is*, 2. p. 99. l. 25. r. *president*. p. 106. l. 26. r. *sending*. p. 115. l. 3. r. *in the humble Edenburgh Remonstrance (of March*. 1. 1648.) p. 118. l. 16. r. *mentioned*. p. 29. 30. p. 121. l. 14. r. *In stead*. p. 159. l. 1. r. p. 37. l. 2. r. *constitution*. l. 3. r. *Sermons alters and changes*. p. 189. l. 8. r. *p. 63*. l. 21. r. 99. l. 25. r. 96. p. 166. l. 29. after 85 add 96. p. 167. l. 31. r. 98. p. 175. l. 29. r. *rumpers*. l. 30. r. *tollerentur*.

The inconvenient distance of the Author from *London*, hath occasioned some Errata's more than ordinary to pass the Press, which I shall desire the Reader to amend with his Pen.

R. Royston.

Lately Printed for *Richard Royston* at the *Angel* in *Amen-Corner*.

THE Estate of the *EMPIRE*: or, an Abridgment of the Laws and Government of *Germany*; further shewing what Condition the *EMPIRE* was in, when the Peace was concluded at *Munster*: Also the several Fights, Battels, and Desolation of Cities during the War in that *EMPIRE*: And also of the *GOLDEN BULL*. In *Octavo*.

The *Sicilian Tyrant*: Or, The *Life* and *Death* of *AGATHOCLES*: With some Reflections on our Modern Usurpers. *Octavo*.

The *ROYAL MARTYR*, and the Dutiful Subject, In two Sermons: By *Gilbert Burnet*. In *Quarto*.

The *Generosity* of *Christian Love*; Delivered in a Sermon, by *William Gould*. Quarto.

The *Witnesses to Christianity*: By *Sr. Patrick*, D.D. *Octavo*.

Doctor Dubitantium: Or, Bishop *Taylors Cases* of *Conscience*. The Fourth Edition. *Folio*.

The *Life* and *Death* of K. *CHARLES* the First: By *R. Perinchief*, D. D. *Octavo*.

A Modest Plea for the Church of *England*. Octavo.

The *Spiritual Sacrifice*, or Devotions and Prayers fitted to the main uses of a Christian Life; by a late Reverend Author. In 12°.

Chirurgical Treatises: By *Richard Wiseman*, Serjeant-Chirurgion to his *MAJESTY*. *Folio*.